THE MUSLIM WORLD

VOL. XL JULY, 1950 No. 3

PRAYER*

With great regret we have discovered, as a result of questioning many individuals, that the majority of young men in the Middle East do not pray at all. Undoubtedly there are some reasons for this condition. We must not say that the young men have become corrupted, because that is not true. No doubt there is corruption today, but there was corruption even in the days when people observed all the edicts of religion. One reason why the young men do not pray today is the spread of education. There is no enmity between true education and the true spirit of religion, but as the result of their early religious education some young men find a conflict between the God of religion and the God whose works they study in the natural sciences. They have discovered the laws of nature and have learned that a man can do for himself what formerly he asked God to do for him. They have discovered that many of the things they have learned about God are only superstitions and have no foundation in reason. They conclude perhaps that the best kind of prayer is good conduct.

We said before that many young men do not pray. As a matter of fact all men everywhere pray. They perhaps do not pray to God, but they pray to money, or fame, or even to other men, for prayer is the language of your relationship to that which you desire most or fear most or reverence most.

The first condition of true prayer is to have a true conception of God. Is He a being sitting on a throne far away, who created the world, set laws which cannot be changed, who places man in a position from which he cannot escape, whose decrees are unchangeable, who sets a fate for all creatures? If God is like this, there is no reason for prayer, because prayer to such a God becomes simply the mutterings

* From *Living Issues*, by the late Rev. John Van Ess, D.D. Obtainable from the Board of Foreign Misions, Reformed Church in America, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. Pp. 96, with portrait. $.25.

of a wretched slave to a powerful merciless master. To know the answer we ask: Has God Himself spoken to us and told us how He wishes us to think of Him? Listen to the words of the prophet David in the Psalms, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." Listen to what our Lord Jesus Christ says, "When ye pray say, Our Father who art in Heaven." In all this we do not limit God and we do not make God like a man. But when He Himself bids us think of Him as a father, it is our privilege to do so. At the same time we must not ascribe to Him the weaknesses which we often find in human fathers. Human fathers often pet their children or show favoritism. They often close their eyes to the faults of their children or make light of them. We must think of God as the possessor of infinite intelligence, a God who placed laws in the universe.

The second condition of true prayer is to have a true conception of yourself, of man, namely, that a man is not a mere animal but has a spirit which God breathed into him. He must reverence himself, he must remember the tradition about God, "Whoever knows himself, in consequence knows his Lord." He must make himself a vessel fit for containing the truth of God and transmitting it to others. All these thoughts about himself must make a man conscious of his high position among the creatures.

Another condition of prayer is a pure heart. God cannot be seen with the eyes of the body, but Christ says, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." Just as a man cannot see clearly through spectacles which are soiled so a man cannot see God if his heart is soiled by covetousness, lust, pride, or jealousy. Also when we pray we cannot expect to be forgiven by God if we have not ourselves forgiven those who have transgressed against us. Remember the parable of the ten thousand pounds. It is also necessary that we pray with desire. If a man approach his king yawning and stretching and appears not to desire to see the king's face, coming only through fear or covetousness or custom, what would the king say? And yet many people approach God in that way. The most important condition of true prayer is humility

(Luke 18:1-14). God wants us to pray and assures us that He will answer our prayers. Said Christ, "Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you." This does not mean that He will always give us exactly what we ask, nor does it mean that He will open the very door at which we knock. Many years ago my friend Hajji Muhsin invited me to dinner at his house. At the appointed time I went to his house and knocked at the door, a very large door on the street. A voice from an upper window said, "Go to the rear of the house, walk past the dung-heap and enter by the small door behind the kitchen." I did so but when I saw my host, I said to him, "Do you wish to treat me as a servant, by making me go to the rear of the house and enter by the servants' door?" He said, "Come with me." So he took me to the front door and there I found that in the entrance way an old well had opened its mouth again right there behind the great front door, and if I had entered by that door I might have fallen into the well. So God does not always open the door at which we knock, because to enter by that door might be harmful to us. One may say: "Since God knows all our needs, why should I pray? and further it is possible that I may ask something harmful to me." But by prayer I sift my needs and desires. If God gives them, I know He approves them, and if He withholds them I know they are not for my good. We always know that God loves us and desires what is good for us. What God gives may be bitter, as some medicines are bitter on the tongue, but we trust the knowledge of the doctor. Sometimes He gives us what we ask in order to teach us. A woman was using a hot flatiron and her little girl was standing by her side. The little girl put forth her hand to touch the iron but the mother warned her. At last when the mother had turned her back the child touched the hot iron and began to scream with pain. Only in this way does man sometimes learn the meaning of what God forbids.

What must be the subject of prayer? Consider the prayer which Jesus taught His disciples, the Lord's Prayer. We see in this prayer that we must seek first God's interests, that His

Kingdom may come, His will be done, His name be kept holy. After that we may ask for ourselves, for our bread, and thus we recognize that God is the source of our living. Then we can ask for forgiveness but on condition that we ourselves first forgive others. Then we ask to be delivered from the tempter. We may ask for other things also but we must always add: "if it be Thy will."

What are the hindrances which we meet in prayer? An electric lamp sometimes does not burn because the point of contact is dirty or rusty. If in our lives the material things come between us and God, our prayers are in vain. The electric current will not pass through wood but passes readily through iron or copper, which are called good conductors. If our thoughts and purposes are earthly and low we cannot expect the blessing of God to flow into our lives.

Prayer is also an act which it is possible to practice until we become proficient in it. We sometimes find that even ignorant people have learned the art of prayer; because they live always close to God they have learned to know God's thoughts, His message, and His purpose.

Now comes a question: We admit that God is all-powerful, but are there not some things which I cannot expect God to do? For example, have I the right to ask God to send rain on this land in midsummer? In other words, have I the right to ask God to break the natural laws which He Himself imposed? Indeed we ourselves do not want God to break or change these laws. We want the law of gravitation to be steady, for then we can build our houses and sleep under a roof without fear and can walk about. We want fire to burn because thus alone can we cook our food. So it is true that we have no right to ask God to break His own laws. We must remember, however, that some laws are higher than other laws even in nature. Why does the sap rise to the top of a high tree against the law of gravitation? It is because the law of capillary attraction is stronger than the law of gravity. Edison and Marconi and others ascended into the upper strata of natural laws and employed these laws for our benefit. So we can by prayer and by breathing the upper air of the spirit learn

the laws by which we can benefit our fellow-men. Our Lord Jesus Christ spent much time in quiet prayer in the desert and on the mountain-top and thus learned the secret by which He could raise the dead, heal the sick, feed the multitude, open the eyes of the blind and drive out evil spirits from men.

To come back to the question: Does God oppose His own laws? I can hold a pencil above the table. It does not fall because my hand is stronger than gravitation. I am the principal of a school. I set rules for the conduct of the pupils. These rules I must myself obey. But if I wish to suspend a rule for the good of one or all the pupils I am not destroying the rule; indeed I establish it. So God can and sometimes does suspend a law of nature for our good.

By prayer we do not increase God's willingness to help us, but we increase our own willingness to be helped. If I stand in a boat which is connected to the wharf by a rope and I pull the rope, I do not draw the wharf nearer to me, but I draw myself nearer to the wharf. So prayer draws me nearer to God. After all this discussion, how shall we define prayer? As breathing is to the body, so prayer is the breathing of the spirit. Often we breathe without thinking about it. So we can pray without using words. We can pray with our thoughts, but especially in our attitude toward God, the attitude of humility and obedience and trust and faith.

JOHN VAN ESS

THE TEACHING OF RELIGION IN EGYPT

Few countries can boast a revered tradition of religious education as ancient as that of Egypt. It was in Alexandria that early Christianity had its famous Catechetical School. Only recently Egypt reminded the world that the famous university of the Azhar was completing its first millennium. Renowned for its instruction in the sciences of the Qur'ān and Muslim jurisprudence, it has been the intellectual center of the Orthodox Muslim world for centuries. Its students are drawn from Java and Morocco, from Pakistan and Ethiopia, as well as from the Sudan and Syria. Under its arcades and in its sunny courtyard since the days of the Middle Ages, mosque preachers, professors of Arabic and canon lawyers and judges have been prepared for leadership in the Islamic World.

For centuries, too, the more elementary type of education in Egypt, such as was given in the village *Kuttāb* was based on religion. Along with reading, writing and simple arithmetic the children memorized the Qur'ān and were instructed in the beliefs and practices of Islam.

On the basis of these schools which gave more than one-third of the daily lesson periods to religious subjects, the Egyptian Government in June 1933 built its scheme for compulsory education. All children between the ages of seven and twelve were required to attend unless they were enrolled in other schools. These elementary schools found in most villages and numerous in the older sections of the large cities formed the broad basis for making literate the growing generation of Egyptians. Projects have been inaugurated for modernizing these compulsory schools, but the curriculum is still heavily weighted with religious subjects.

The Christian population which is eight or nine percent. of the total has protested that there was no provision in the compulsory scheme for teaching the Christian religion to children of that faith. No general satisfactory scheme for granting Christian children education in their

own faith has been evolved, although proposals and counter proposals were made by the Ministry and the Coptic leaders. Christians in the end found the most secure means for guaranteeing a Christian education to their children in continuing or establishing their own elementary schools. Although they were compelled to share in the support of state schools they willingly contributed as well to elementary Christian schools where their children could develop in an environment sympathetic to their growth in the Christian life.

With the introduction of a Western type of education into Egypt, as well as other lands of the Near East, by Christian missionary societies and other organizations the core of the curriculum was no longer Quranic. True, both Roman Catholic and Protestant schools which were established in Egypt emphasized religion, for they believed Christianity to be the essential factor in the creation of the true ideal of education.

By the beginning of the present century the Egyptian Government had a system of primary and secondary education modeled on the schools of Europe. Certificates were granted to those who successfully completed the prescribed course of study. The way before them offered either posts in Government offices or entrance into higher schools for training doctors, lawyers and engineers.

The claim of religion to a place in the school program was to be noticed in the requirements for the study of the Qur'ān and the Muslim religion. However, the time allotted was meager and they were not subjects requiring a successful examination before promotion.

Since 1940 there has been increasing agitation in Government circles for the enactment of a law forbidding religious propaganda. This was directed in part against mission schools and hospitals, for it was plainly said in Parliament that there was no intention by its provision to prevent the broadcasting of the Qur'ān over the radio and other public recognition that Islam is the religion of the state.

Law 38, passed in 1948, which dealt with the organi-

zation of Private Schools provided in Article 21, says, "No school may teach its pupils, boys and girls, a religion other than their own, even with the consent of the parents."

As a result of this law, certain Christian missionary schools, because they considered formal instruction in Christian religion an essential part of their program, refused to receive non-Christian pupils in their schools.

At the same time this Law 38 made it incumbent on private schools preparing for public examinations held by the Ministry of Education to follow the syllabus prescribed by the Ministry.

In August 1949 the Minister of Education decided that the Qur'ān and Islamic religion should be subjects required for promotional examinations in schools which prepare pupils for the general examinations of the Egyptian Government.

A course of study was outlined. The following directive for teachers of Middle schools gives clear evidence of the aims and methods of such instruction:

"1. The teaching of Islamic religion in the Secondary Schools has the following aims:

(1) The implanting of sound doctrines in the souls of the students so that their hearts may fear God and love Him openly and secretly and they may obey and worship Him in truth.

(2) The knowledge of a goodly amount of the judgments of the religion which our lord Muhammad brought from God, especially what has to do with matters of worship so that every youth may perform them correctly.

(3) The increase in students of Islamic culture so that so many good social virtues may be implanted in them. This will include something of the life of the apostle and his *Jihād* (Holy War) in presenting the call to God and the establishing of the pillars of the sound religion: something of the story of his Companions and the First Caliphs who strove with him, and of his fellow soldiers in Islam.

(4) The study of something from the Qur'ān and the prophet's *Sunna* (Traditions) which is connected with doctrines, matters of worship and Islamic ethics.

"2. The means to be used in realizing these aims are that:

(1) The teacher is to find in the history of the Apostle and his

Jihād in spreading religion a way for studying the subjects of the program. Every subject is to be followed by a verse from the Qur'ān, Traditions from the Prophet and Islamic precedents.

(2) The teacher is to endeavor to reach the hearts of the pupils and awaken their religious emotions and in a practical way implant in their hearts the virtues of religion.

(3) The rites of religion are the most substantial pillars for establishing it in the heart. Therefore teachers must be very careful to perform them.

(4) A good example is more practical to the human soul than many sermons, so the teachers must be a good example to the students.

(5) The religious festivals and occasions are a fitting opportunity for broadcasting the Islamic spirit in the souls of the students. Therefore, the observance of them and keeping of them is a way for building up Islamic virtues. If we find help for this in some hymns and prayers, this will have a great effect (influence).

(6) Attention must be given to preparing a place for the performance of worship and to enable the school to facilitate for its students the performance of worship in which the Muslim teachers share. It will be a good thing sometimes to have, following the worship, a short talk of a religious nature on matters pertaining to life.

(7) The pupils should be encouraged to go to the mosque on Fridays and at feast times to perform congregational worship so as to feel the greatness and high purposes of Islam.

(8) Benevolent societies should be formed in each school to enable the students from their childhood to share in works of righteousness and grow up to love and do good.

(9) Youth are exposed at certain times in their lives to problems and crises that bring perplexity and unrest in their minds and there wander in their hearts whisperings and murmurings which demand treatment and guidance. It is well that the teacher open up his heart to the students so that it may be easy for them to talk about what is troubling their souls and express what is hidden in their consciences. Then the teacher will find a way for guidance and helping one to reform after discussion and persuasion."

The decision of the Minister to make the Qur'ān and the Islamic religion the subject of promotional examinations raised two important questions: Are Christian schools required to teach their Muslim pupils these subjects, and what provision is to be made for the instruction of non-

Muslim students in Government schools in their own religion?

The Ministry answered the first question in a note dated August 27, 1949, and circularized by the Controller of Private Schools:

> "Schools whose circumstances do not allow them to teach the Qur'ān and the Islamic Religion to their Muslim pupils should ask for the cooperation of the Ministry of Education in arranging for and agreeing to the teaching of these two subjects; or they should present to the Ministry a pledge signed by the guardian of each Muslim pupil in school that he will teach the subjects of the Qur'ān and Religion to his son as they are required of him, and prepare him for the promotional examination in them.
>
> "In both cases the Ministry itself will conduct promotional examinations for these pupils in these subjects, and no student will be promoted to the next higher class unless he succeeds in the subjects of Religion and the Qur'ān."

The other question has been the concern of various Christian groups. The questions of a proper syllabus of study and adequate training of Christian teachers have both received considerable study. In September and October various Christian writers complained in the daily press that no program for Christian pupils was being planned nor had the Ministry convened a special committee to deal with this matter. The Coptic Patriarch, as the leader of that Christian group which is by far the largest, sent one of his bishops to consult with the Minister on the matter and Senator Tawfik Doss, a former Cabinet member, also conferred with him. It was agreed that Christian students would be taught their religion, but there is to be no examination nor restriction by this law on their promotion.

Does this year, then, mark a definite milestone in the Egyptian Government's policy regarding the teaching of religion? Have the country's leaders realized the peril of too much secularization of education? Is religion as necessary to national life in the twentieth century as in the tenth or fifteenth?

Some suggest that this emphasis on religion as a fundamental in the education system is only a passing phase.

They remind us of former waves of enthusiasm that radically modified the school curricula, but only for a time. Reformers who demanded manual training for all introduced the study of carpentry into the primary course of the Government program some twenty years ago. All schools preparing for Government examinations found it necessary to purchase hammers and saws and work benches. However, in a short time another educational expert revised the program and this subject was eliminated.

Again in 1938 under the threatening clouds of war, the Minister of Education issued an order that physical education and military training were to become required subjects for promotional examinations in Secondary Schools. This regulation has become outdated and lies forgotten under the many directives issued since that time.

There are those who argue that the present regulations regarding the teaching of religion are only a gesture on the part of certain politicians to gain favor with the ultra-conservative groups in the approaching election for members of Parliament. It is suggested that the enforcement of the regulations pertaining to promotion will bring a protest from Muslim students because success in a religious examination is not required of non-Muslims.

Others find in the new regulations a move to emphasize to younger generations the importance of Islamic culture. Nationalism in the Near East is almost always linked with emphasis on Arab Unity. And Arabism, we are reminded by many writers, is Islam.

In a world governed by economic and political blocs of nations, the lands of the Middle East along with Pakistan must be united if they are to maintain their rights and liberties. The strong tie that binds them is the Muslim faith.

Some leaders, among them those who have directed the policy of the Ministry of Education, sponsor the movement for compulsory education in religion because of the threat of Russian ideology. The Egyptian youth needs to be grounded thoroughly in the tenets of his faith. Otherwise

the seven devils of Communism will come in and make their abode with him.

These are some of the conflicting currents of opinion on this important question. The main tendency during the past decades in adopting the ideals of Western education has been completely away from any religious-centered program. Any restrictions however on the teaching of religion have been aimed at the prevention of Muslim children's being exposed to any other faith than their own. Religion has not been outlawed but ignored. Thousands of the Egyptian youth educated in modern sciences may profess their undying loyalty to Islam, but they frankly admit that they are ignorant of its precepts and practices.

Is the present move a vain attempt to restore a fading concept of culture or is it the sign of a religious revival? History alone will reveal that.

E. E. Elder

Cairo, Egypt

Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. Bābūyē, a writer of the Shi'a who died in 991 A.D., wrote a book, the *Reasons for Civil and Religious Laws* (*'Ilal al-sharā'i' wa 'l-aḥkām,* Brockelmann, C., *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur,* I, 187 and Supplement I, 321), which combines folklore with religion. There is some conflation. The earth is supported on the shoulder of an angel who stands on a rock which rests on the horns of a bull which stands on a fish; the fish is in the sea which rests on darkness under which is the barren and under it moisture and only God knows what is below the moisture. The fish thought, "By my own might I hold up the earth." God sent a fish, one span long, to enter the nostril of the fish to annoy it for a month and now, whenever He wishes to cause an earthquake, He has only to let the fish see the little one.

When God created Adam, He set his fate before him and his hopes behind; but when he fell into sin, God put his hopes in front of him and his fate behind (where he cannot see it). On Thursday God sent down to earth a heavenly virgin for Adam to marry her to Seth; in the afternoon (an oath taken of an afternoon is especially binding) God sent down another who was married to Japhet. Seth begot a boy and Japhet a girl; they married and from them the best of the prophets are descended. Another version is that God sent down two virgins from heaven; one married a son of Adam and from her derive all good men while the other married a *jinnī* and from her descend all bad men.

No births happened for forty years before the flood so no innocent children perished in it. There is a similiar Jewish tale. At first the rainbow had a string and arrow but God removed them when He made the bow a sign of safety.

Besides giving the usual explanations of Rass (Qur'ān 25, 40) it is said that they worshipped a pine tree which was planted by Japhet near a spring and grew up for Noah after the flood. They had twelve towns on the river Rass; the sacred tree was in the capital though the other towns had

their own trees. They had led a canal from the spring to the tree and held the water of the spring and canal to be sacred and neither they nor their animals drink from them. If anyone did so, they put him to death for they thought that the water was the life of the gods and it was not fitting that anyone should diminish their life. They and the cattle drink from the river Rass. In every town they held a festival. In the provincial festivals they hanged figured silks on the tree, sacrificed sheep and cattle and lighted fires round it. When the smoke of the sacrifices went up and shut out the view of the sky, they fell down and adored the tree that it might be well pleased with them. Then the devil came, shook the tree and cried from the trunk like a boy, "I am well pleased with you, my servants; be of good cheer." Then they raised their heads, drank wine and played music for a day and a night. To the feast in the capital came great and small. They pitched a tent of figured brocade with twelve doors, one for each town, and worshipped the pine with offerings more numerous than those in the other towns. Then the devil came, shook the tree violently and out of the midst of it spoke elemental words, making promises more than those made by the devils in the other towns. Then they raised their heads from their prostration and joy beyond compare was in them; they did not speak for drinking and music which went on for twelve days.

The angel of death has two forms, handsome and hideous, according as he appears to a good or a bad man; this is Jewish. It was the angel of death who brought to Abraham the news that he was to be called the Friend of God. When Abraham was cast into the fire at Nimrod's order, Gabriel met him as he was flying through the air and asked him if he wanted anything. He answered, "From you, no." Then God commanded the fire to be cold and for three days it did not heat water and was of no use to men. Abraham saw something in his beard, asked God what it was, and was told that it was dignity. He said, "Increase my dignity." So now old men have white hair. According to a Jewish story, Abraham was the first to show signs of old age. Another story is that

Adam was so tall that his head rubbed against the sky and this made him bald, a defect he bequeathed to his descendants.

Isaac had a belt which the great prophets inherited one from another. When Abraham was cast into the fire, he was given a shirt made from the silk of paradise; it was passed on to Isaac, then to Jacob and then to Joseph. It was kept in an amulet and when it was taken out of its case, Jacob smelt the scent of paradise a distance of ten days' journey. Finally it came to Muḥammad. When Jacob and Joseph met in Egypt, Jacob dismounted but Joseph did not. In punishment for his pride not one of his descendants was a prophet. Moses was a servant to the prophet Shu'aib; his shoes were made from the skin of a dead donkey. He died when he wished to die, i.e., when he saw his abode in paradise. The angel of death dug his grave. The angel of death takes no bribes and fears not kings.

Because of the talk about Mary (19, 28) Zachariah fled, pursued by the devil and the baser sort. He took refuge in a hollow tree which closed upon him. The devil bade the men saw the tree across but Zachariah felt no pain. Angels washed his body (contrary to the Muslim rule for martyrs) and said prayers over him for three days.

If Khaḍir sat on dry wood or bare ground, it burst into flower.

Do not smack infants when they cry; for four months their crying is a repeating of the confession of faith, for four months a blessing on the prophet and for four months a prayer for their parents. Pleasure which has no apparent cause is due to the presence of the guardian angel, grief to the presence of a devil. Another explanation, peculiar to the Shi'a is this: when an infant smiles without cause, it is because it sees and talks to the *imām;* when the *imām* goes away, it cries. When the child begins to use its reason, this gate to the unseen is shut. God provides richly for fools so that wise men may know that worldly success is not to be obtained by brains and craft. Widespread was the idea that God created two seas, one sweet and light and one dark and salt. Reason

was the first of the spiritual powers which God created; then he created its opposite, *jahl* (ignorance, brutishness), from the dark salt sea. He created prophets, the righteous, and the imams from the sweet sea, men of violence from the salt, and the hearts and bodies of prophets from the clay of the upper world.

Moses was sent with his white hand and staff because sorcery ruled in his day; Jesus was sent as a physician because diseases were rife; Muḥammad was sent with the word of God and his sermons because the men of his day were orators —and some say poets—so he made what they had to say of no effect. All revealed books were Arabic; prophets understood them in the language of their peoples. In whatever tongue Muḥammad was addressed, the meaning was conveyed to him in Arabic.

There is no tree or palm but has an angel to guard it and its fruit; so defaecation under fruit trees is forbidden. At first all trees bore fruit but when men said that God had a son, half of them became thorns. The date palm was made from the remnant of the earth from which Adam was made so it has to be fertilised artificially and dies if its head is cut off.

The purpose of Muḥammad's journey to heaven was to honor him by showing him to the angels. During this journey the order of prayer was taught to him in heaven. Another story is that Adam was taught the order of prayer. The washing of the feet and hands and the wiping of the hair in the legal ablution is derived from his sin; he walked to the tree, took the fruit, put his hand on his head while his face was turned to the tree. Another explanation is that the Helpers were farmers and the sweaty smell of their bodies annoyed other worshippers and so the ablution was ordained. In the bath certain acts should be avoided because of their evil consequences. Lying down in it causes the fat of the kidneys to disappear, lying on the back causes a complaint in the belly, the use of the comb is bad for the hair, the use of the toothpick is bad for the teeth, washing the head with clay (? fuller's earth) makes the face ugly, rubbing the head and face with a loincloth spoils the complexion, rubbing the

soles of the feet with a piece of earthenware induces leprosy, and one should not wash in the waste water in which is collected the dirt from Jews, Christians, Magians and the enemies of the prophet's family, which is worst of all, for God did not create anything more foul than a dog and the enemy of the prophet's family is fouler than it. Sitting in the latrine for a long time causes piles.

Before Muḥammad had left Mecca a Muslim died in Medina and gave orders that he should be buried with his face towards Muḥammad; this was the origin of the custom of burying the dead facing Mecca. Expensive grave clothes should be provided, for the dead boast of them. They must not be red in color. Camphor is the only perfume to be rubbed on the corpse which is as it were taboo. A dead body should not be left alone lest the devil work mischief inside it. A creature does not die till the drop, from which it was created, goes out of it, from the mouth or otherwise. If a branch is planted on a grave or water sprinkled on it, as long as the branch is green or the earth moist, punishment is kept at a distance. A victim of misfortune should not wear a cloak (*ridā'*); cursed is he who puts off his cloak for the misfortune of another. Moses interceded for his people with Muḥammad and he could not refuse the intercession of his brother prophet. The moon did not shine on the children of Israel, so God told Moses to take the bones of Joseph from Egypt and then they would get the light of the moon. None but a blind, crippled woman knew where the tomb was and for showing it she demanded to have her sight and youth given back, her leg made strong and a place in paradise. The Jews say that the woman was the mother of Moses but do not mention the bargain.

The guardian angels of night and day are both present at the pre-dawn prayer (17, 80); it is short because the angels ascend and descend so quickly. The sun rises between the two horns of the devil. The afternoon (*'aṣr*) is the hour at which Adam ate of the tree and was turned out of paradise and at which hell will be brought to judgment at the resurrection. Muḥammad said it was the hour in which his Lord

blessed him. Worship is not allowed in the middle of the day for then the gates of heaven are shut. Men pray two sections after the evening prayer because they do not know if they will die during the night; by revelation Muḥammad did know so he did not observe these prayers. The slave woman must not be veiled at worship, to mark her off from the free woman. A man must not worship with his sword in front of him as a "fence" for the *qibla* is a sign of security. The leader of worship should not be girt with a sword, for that is how tyrants behave. A man should not wear gold, for it is part of the dress of paradise. Black clothes are worn by those bound for hell or, according to another version, by Pharaoh. Iron seals are carried by those bound for hell. There is no legal alms on gold ornaments, for they bring in no profit. The legal alms on money and goods is two and a half per cent, for there are twenty-five poor in every thousand men. Turning the cloak inside out during the prayer for rain is sympathetic magic.

When Adam ate of the forbidden tree the food remained in his belly thirty days, so the fast of Ramadan lasts thirty days. After eating he turned black; he was told to fast on the thirteenth of Ramadān and the two following days and each day one third of his body turned white. He who sleeps on the night of the twenty third of this month will not make the pilgrimage in that year. The smelling of certain perfumes during the fast is established custom; the smelling of herbs is an innovation. The Persians say that the smelling of scents stays hunger.

Statements about the Ka'ba and the pilgrimage are confused and contradictory. The Ka'ba is a copy of a building in heaven which is called both "the well built house" and *ḍurāḥ;* the house is said to be in the fourth heaven and also in the first heaven, corresponding to the *ḍurāḥ* which is in the fourth. A ruby from paradise was put on the site of the Ka'ba and as far as its light reached was sacred ground. God created the Black Stone, then took the declaration of men, "Thou art our God," and said to the Stone, "Swallow it." At the resurrection it will speak against men by repeating

this confession. Adam had kicked it in paradise; on earth he recognised it and kissed it. It was originally white but turned black through the wickedness of men; had it not been for this, no sick man could have touched it without being healed. Belonging to another circle of ideas is the statement that it was a great angel and was sent down to Adam in India. A woman gave yarn to help make a covering for the Ka'ba. Her agent asked the *Imām* Muḥammad al-Bāqir what he should do with it. The *Imām* said, "Buy with it honey and saffron, take earth from the grave of Abū 'Abdullah, knead it with rainwater, put in it some of the honey and saffron and distribute to my followers to give as medicine to their sick. The running between Marwa and Ṣafā is in imitation of Abraham who fled from the devil there. The common explanation is that it is a copy of Hagar's search for water. When Eve let down her hair on Marwa the wind blew the fragrance to India so it became the land of perfumes; a variant is that Adam's tears in India became perfumes. At the feast of sacrifice an ox suffices for five men, because five Hebrews worshipped the golden calf; this is a confusion with the animal mentioned in the second chapter of the Qur'ān. The bull keeps its head down in shame because Israel worshipped the golden calf. At one point on the road to Mecca the devils molest pilgrims, but when they hear, "God is very great," they fly away, pursued by angels till they fall into the dark deep. At God's command part of the province of Jordan went in procession seven times round the Ka'ba and then went to Ṭā'if.

A drink was made by boiling down grape juice till it was one third of its original volume. Two stories explain this. Adam was given two vines from paradise; when the grapes were ripe the devil claimed them, so they appealed to Gabriel. He cast fire on the vines and burnt two thirds of them; this was the devil's share and the rest was given to Adam. Noah had a vine in the ark. The devil stole it and planted it. Noah was told by his guardian angel that he would have a partner in pressing the grapes; he began by offering the

partner one seventh but the bargaining ended by the devil getting two thirds.

There is a long list of creatures which are metamorphosed humans. It is usually said that Canopus was once a tax-gatherer in Yemen and Venus a woman who seduced Harut and Marut. It is argued that sinners would not be changed into stars which last as long as the universe, so these two were animals in the outer ocean which ships cannot reach. A metamorphosed human does not live more than fifteen days so the animals, which bear these names, are only like the first metamorphosis.

Prophets did not need to be circumcised as their foreskins dropped off on the seventh day; Sarah envied Hagar, so Isaac had to be circumcised as a punishment.

The devil served God among the *jinn* for twelve thousand years and, when they were destroyed, complained of loneliness so God raised him to the lowest heaven where he served among the angels for another twelve thousand years. He urged the wild beasts to devour Adam and Eve but two dogs to protect them were formed from his spittle. Comparable with this is the tale that, when the ark was overrun with mice, the lion sneezed and produced two cats. When Adam and Eve were driven out of paradise, the devil and the snake came with them; as these had no partners they begot offspring from themselves.

When a man takes his bride home, he should take off her shoes, wash her feet and throw the water from the door to the furthest part of the house; during the first week he should prevent her from eating milk, vinegar, coriander and sour apples. A child conceived on the night following Ramadan will not have a son till he is an old man, while one conceived on a Monday will learn the Qur'ān by heart and be content with what God gives him. Hair on the body should not be allowed to grow long, for then the devil will hide in it. Pulling out the hair of the armpits is better than shaving and a depilatory is better still. Contracts should be written, for Adam forgot that he had promised thirty years of

his life to David. In company it is wrong to eat several kinds of fruit together but, if alone, it does not matter. It is wrong to blow on food to cool it; some say it is only wrong in company. The spleen and testicles are forbidden food for they were the devil's share of the ram which Abraham sacrificed instead of his son. Whistling is condemned, for by whistling Lot's wife betrayed that her husband had guests. The Jewish story is that she gave them away by borrowing salt from a neighbor. The selling of grave clothes is a forbidden trade. If a monarch is just, God commands the lord of the sphere to turn it slowly so that his days may be long.

A man's share in an inheritance is double that of a woman because Adam ate twice as much of the forbidden fruit as Eve. When he praised God, a fruit tree appeared and when she praised Him, one with no fruit. Gabriel brought seed; what Adam sowed became wheat and what Eve sowed became barley. The goat disobeyed Noah so its tail is twisted and its genital organs prominent. God told Abraham that the earth felt shame on seeing his private parts, so he must put a screen between them. Abraham thereupon invented trousers. The Kurds are a tribe of *jinn* from whom God has taken away the covering. When Muḥammad was taken up to heaven, his sweat fell down and from it grew the rose. But some fell in water and fish and tadpoles claimed it as theirs and tried to seize it. God sent an angel to decide between them who gave them half each. So the leaves under the flowers are five, two in the shape of a fish, two in that of a tadpole, and one which is half fish and half tadpole. Three should not ride on one animal because the one in front is accursed.

The following explanations of the importance of ʿĀshūrā are false: it was the day on which God turned to Adam; the repentance of David was accepted; Jonah was delivered from the belly of the fish and the ark rested on Judi.

A. S. Tritton

University of London

WHY A MUSLIM OFFICIAL CHANGED HIS FAITH

It would be interesting to have a catalogue of all the reasons that have induced Moslems to leave their ancestral faith and accept Christianity. It is our experience in Iran that these reasons are manifold. Some have made the change through study of the Gospels, some from dissatisfaction with Islam, some through a comparative study of the two religions. Sometimes it has been a chance word or a special verse of Scripture that has made a lasting impression. Again it may have been a sermon or the conversation of a friend. Occasionally it has been a dream or a vision. Oftentimes it has been the character or the loving service of some Christian or the transformation of life seen in a Muslim convert. Once in a while the change results from an experience that seems little short of miraculous—God Himself reaching out in a marvelous way to draw a man to a new and vital faith.

In this last category is the story of Mer'at-es-Sultan, a well known Christian of Teheran. Shortly before his death in the summer of 1948 he wrote up in Persian the account of his conversion to Christianity in a little tract entitled "How I Was Saved," which has since been widely distributed. The story goes back to about 1912, when Mer'at-es-Sultan was Chief of Police and Commanding Officer of the Gendarmerie in the province of Azerbaijan in northwest Iran. At that time an army of the Tsarist regime entered Tabriz on the ground of protecting Russian subjects, arrested some of the leading men of the city, and planned to seize and execute Mer'at-es-Sultan, who telegraphed his resignation to the capital, and fled in disguise toward Turkey.

The narrative that follows is an abbreviated translation of his own account, given in the third person, as he himself wrote it.

* * * * *

At the time of his departure from the city of Tabriz his route lay by Majambar, an Armenian village in the neighborhood. Because of heavy snow and severe cold he took

refuge in the house of a priest who lived there. After forty days the weather improved, it stopped snowing, and the roads opened up. So then he determined to continue his journey to Turkey.

At the time of leaving the priest's home his host offered a prayer for the departing traveler and at the same time addressed him thus: "My dear guest, during all the time you have stayed in my home I have prayed every day in the presence of Jesus Christ for your deliverance from the wickedness of the Russians. I have asked that your journey should be without danger, in perfect safety, and free from the evil machinations of enemies, and that you should reach your home. I know that Christ will keep you safe until you get to your family. But are you on your part ready to promise Christ in your heart that when you arrive safely at your home you will not forget him, but will yield yourself to your Saviour?"

"Of course," said Mer'at-es-Sultan, giving his word to the priest, and started off.

With the greatest gladness the priest again spoke: "Go, and rest assured that Christ will deliver you. But on your part do not forget your promise."

For several months Mer'at-es-Sultan was a fugitive in Turkey from the injustice of the Russian government, until at last he entered Zenjan by way of Saujbulagh and started on his way toward Kazvin in order to get to Teheran. Twelve miles out of Kazvin he stopped at a teahouse, expecting the next day to reach the city. In the middle of the night Russian cossacks seized him while he was in bed and took him to Kazvin under guard. He was kept for a while in the Russian Consulate, but was later confined in the military camp in Kazvin to be sent to the Caucasus for execution.

He was imprisoned in a dark cell for a long time. He was not told the reason for the delay, and every day he was awaiting the outcome of the case. One day the door of his cell was unlocked and a colonel of the Russian army en-

tered, saying, "Come along." Escorted by the colonel, the prisoner left the jail and together they entered the street. At the side, just opposite the prison gate, a photographer was standing with his camera in expectation of the prisoner. As soon as he saw him, he took one picture of him standing and one sitting, then left.

The colonel then took the "criminal" back to his cell. Before he left the jail he asked the prisoner: "Since you will be our guest for one day and a night, you may make any request of me that you wish, in order that I may grant it for you."

Mer'at-es-Sultan asked: "What was the purpose of those two pictures that were taken of me?"

The colonel replied: "One picture will be sent to the Caucasus and the other will be kept in the Kazvin Consulate."

The prisoner said: "I thank you. I have no further request."

"I think it is necessary for me to introduce myself to you," said the colonel. "As a matter of fact, I am one of the princes of the royal family of Iran, a descendant of Prince Bahman Mirza of the family of Fath Ali Shah. It was the extreme of my fate that I should be far separated from my native land and enter the military service of a foreign country. Now that you know who I am, that I am no stranger, don't be afraid to ask me what I can do for you. I shall not hold back."

"That being the case," said the prisoner, "I can make known my real desire to you. From the taking of the two pictures of me I knew that the order for my execution had arrived from Russia. Can you tell me plainly what day you have set for it?"

He replied, "Tomorrow morning at nine o'clock."

The conversation finished, the colonel left the cell and the door was again locked.

That night the prisoner could not sleep, so great was his anxiety. Every minute he was expecting the dawn of

day and the hour when they would take him from his cell and lead him out to his execution. The night passed. At nine o'clock in the morning the sound of the Russian soldiers' bugles brought an end to the prisoner's state of expectancy. Forthwith fear and panic involuntarily seized him from head to foot, so that he forgot the world and everything in it. The one thing that came to his mind in this distraught state was the word of the Majambar priest, who had said, "Don't forget Christ."

During all the months of imprisonment, in the corner of his dark cell where he passed day and night, he had always from his heart brought God Most High to mind and had besought all the prophets and imams by name to intercede for him. He prayed day and night for his deliverance, but he sensed no answering assurance in his heart.

In this last hour, when there was no longer hope from any source, the words of the priest came to his mind and he turned his distraught heart toward Christ before the door of the cell should be opened for him. At once he lifted his hands in prayer, saying, "O Jesus Christ, if thou livest and art the Saviour of sinful men, deliver me, a sinner, from this plight, that I may believe on thee."

No sooner had he finished his prayer than the cell door was opened. The same colonel of the day before entered and said, "Come, let us go."

The prisoner left the jail in absolute despair and distress and entered the street. On both sides of the avenue he noticed a large detachment of Russian soldiers and cossacks, besides the twenty-five who accompanied the colonel, watching him and patrolling back and forth in front of the shops. A great crowd of Iranians, men and women, were gathered on the roofs on either side of the street. Because one Iranian officer in the course of service to his fatherland had to be executed in his own country by foreigners, they were all in a state of mourning and weeping and with their tears they were bidding the prisoner farewell. At this moving spectacle the prisoner was seized with great agitation

and was so torn with emotion that he completely forgot himself. Just the wood of the gallows appeared before his eyes and he looked for a miracle.

Of course no one but God and the prisoner condemned to death can understand how he felt. He was like a living corpse walking in the midst of his escort without any will of his own and going to his place of execution. In this condition, so distraught that he was beside himself, he prayed in his heart: "O Jesus Christ, dost thou see how this people of thine are about to hang me unjustly on the gallows? Deliver me from what I anticipate. If thou art a Saviour, save me, that I may believe on thee."

While he still went on his way in a state of prayer, all at once he saw an Iranian officer, accompanied by twelve Iranian soldiers, take his stand in front of the Russian colonel and hand him a letter. After receiving and reading the letter, the colonel looked at the prisoner, smiled, took his hand and put it in the hand of the Iranian officer. Then with all his soldiers and cossacks he turned back.

After taking the hand of the prisoner, the Iranian officer said, "Agha Mer'at-es-Sultan, come, let us go," and started off. All marched along the road in silence. After about half an hour's march they reached the Kazvin police headquarters and took the prisoner into the room of the Chief. The officer showed him to the chair behind the Chief's desk and said: "Sit down and drink some tea, while I inform the governor of Kazvin of your arrival."

After the officer had left the room, the prisoner came to himself and asked the attendant: "Who was the officer that brought me to this room?"

The attendant replied, "The Chief of Police of Kazvin."

This thought then came to the prisoner's mind: "Since this spot is part of Iran, and the Russians have no legal right to execute an Iranian themselves, they are therefore obliged to turn me over to the governor of Kazvin so that I can be executed by an Iranian official. Hence the Chief of Police has gone to inform the governor of my arrival, to report that he has taken custody of the condemned man, and to

ask what is to be done. Doubtless he will return after an hour and they will execute me. At all events it is a source of satisfaction that I am to be executed by the hand of an Iranian. Since this is the case, while there is a chance, it would be well for me to use the opportunity to write my will, that they may give it to my family after my death."

At once he took pen and paper from the desk in front of him and began to write his will. At this juncture the Chief of Police returned from the governor's and entered the room. He was surprised to see the prisoner writing and went right over to him and asked, "What are you writing?"

The prisoner replied: "I ask your pardon, I am writing my will for my family, so that after my death you may send it to them by whatever means are available."

On hearing these words the Chief of Police was greatly agitated, grabbed the paper from the prisoner's hands, and tore it up, saying: "You don't mean to say you are planning to commit suicide, do you? God forbid!"

"I have no such intention," replied the prisoner, "but you are under orders to execute me."

In surprise the Chief said: "Agha Mer'at-es-Sultan, now I perceive that you are altogether suffering from misapprehension and are entirely uninformed as to what has been going on. Drink your tea, please, while I explain the facts and relieve your misunderstanding."

Thereupon he ordered tea brought, sat down opposite the prisoner, and proceeded thus: "From the day the Russians arrested you and put you in confinement the governor of Kazvin knew about it. He notified the government about the proceedings by telegraph and secured instructions to take steps for your release through the Russian consul. The negotiations between the government and the Russian Legation, the conversations between the governor and the Russian consul, and the communications of the Legation and Consulate with the Imperial Russian Court, proceeded in a state of utter hopelessness until yesterday. Last night two telegrams arrived for the governor from Teheran. One was from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the other from

the Ministry of the Interior. The gist of the contents of the two was that strict orders had been issued by the Russian Legation to the Consulate in Kazvin that they should immediately turn over Mer'at-es-Sultan to the governor of Kazvin to be sent at once to Teheran. These telegrams arrived several hours after nightfall, by which time the consul had retired. To call on him at that time of night was out of question: there was nothing to do but to wait till morning. Today I was appointed to call on the consul and show him the telegrams. I succeeded in calling on him at nine o'clock and secured written instructions to the Russian officers to turn you over to me without delay and bring you here. So this has been done. I have just met the governor and he has instructed me to send you to Teheran. Now you are absolutely free from the bonds of Russian arrest, and whenever you wish, you may go to Teheran. And finally, so that the Russians cause you no further trouble on the road, an officer and several gendarmes will escort you to Teheran for your safety. This is in brief the explanation of what has happened."

After the Chief of Police had finished his statement, the prisoner asked, "Which direction is the *qibleh?*" He showed him which direction to face. At once the prisoner fell on his knees to the ground, touched his forehead to the floor, and out of his heart poured forth these words: "O Thou who art the only God and my Creator, praise be to thy great power that thou hast forgiven me for the sake of Jesus Christ and hast delivered me from death. In thy holy presence I acknowledge that this deliverance has come to me from Jesus Christ, and herewith in thy most radiant presence, O my God, I make my confession and my pledge that so long as I live, I belong to Christ; so long as I live, I shall continue to live in the hope of the love of Christ. And Christ I recognize as the Saviour of sinners, of whom I myself am one."

He then raised himself from his prostration, and at the same time felt within himself a kind of ecstasy which is beyond the realm of human understanding. Joy unbounded

seized him. He took the Chief's hand in his two hands and said: "I am under the greatest obligation to you personally. Now give me permission to find means of transportation for myself."

With an escort of an officer and several gendarmes Mer-'at-es-Sultan left Kazvin and after two days arrived in Teheran, where he entered the premises of the Court and Council of Ministers. He met the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior. The latter, on meeting him, kissed him on the cheek and said: "Be sure that God Most High delivered you from death, and according to my way of thinking this was a miracle. For the time being you must be our guest in the Ministry of the Interior until we can secure from St. Petersburg through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs your release from this unexpected arrest."

The stay in the Ministry of the Interior lasted a year. The Cabinet changed. The new Prime Minister, together with the Minister of the Interior, took such steps that the following telegram arrived from the Imperial Court of the Tsar of Russia: "Mer'at-es-Sultan is released with the proviso that he not leave Teheran and that the government guarantee this."

One day, when he was at liberty after leaving the Court, he met one of his old friends. After exchange of the usual greetings the friend said: "Mer'at-es-Sultan, during the time that you were in the Russian prison confined in the dark, I went to Kazvin for spreading the Word of God and learned that you were in dangerous confinement. In the presence of God Almighty, making Jesus Christ my intercessor, I did not cease to pray for your release until I heard that you had reached Teheran in safety. Now I tell you that you are indebted to Christ for your deliverance."

After he had finished what he had to day, Mer'at replied to him: "My dear friend, I myself well know that Jesus Christ delivered me. Tell me what I am to do."

The friend answered: "Believe on Christ, in order that you may have peace in this world and the next and secure forgiveness of your sins through faith in Christ."

The next day Mer'at and the friend went to meet a missionary by the name of Mr. Schuler. After being introduced, Mer'at said: "Mr. Schuler, I have been delivered from certain death, and that by the help of Jesus Christ. Now I have come to you to confess my faith. Tell me what my duty is."

It happened that it was a Friday and a group of Muslim converts was present at the meeting. They arose together and gathered around Mer'at-es-Sultan. He kneeled down and they all put their hands on his head, praying for him and asking a spiritual blessing for him. From this time on revelations one after another came to him and day by day his faith in Christ grew stronger.

* * * * *

Of course he had to tell his wife that he had become a Christian and it was with much trepidation that he approached the ordeal. Would she demand a divorce, or would she still be willing to live with him? What was his great surprise and infinite joy to find that she was delighted to tell him that she had been studying the Bible with one of the lady missionaries and was herself a Christian.

Mer'at-es-Sultan served for many years as steward of the American Hospital in Teheran. He became a deacon in the church and later an elder, serving in the latter capacity for many years.

He spent much of his time in his late years in prayer, in Bible study, and in reading Christian literature. One of the projects in which he was especially interested was the purchase of a cemetery for the Teheran Church and one of his repeated injunctions was that he himself should be buried there. When he died, however, influential Muslim relatives insisted on his burial in a Muhammadan cemetery, but they could not prevent his spirit from finding its well-earned reward in that heaven where his Master is adored as King of kings and Lord of lords.

C. H. Allen

Babol, Iran

THE QUR'ĀN AS SCRIPTURE III

Once a pattern of the nature of the prophetic mission had begun to form in Muḥammad's mind, based on what he had learned from the People of the Book, it was but natural that he should develop his thought of his own mission in terms of this pattern of the prophetic succession. As they were warners, so is he a warner (*mundhir,* LXXIX.45; XIII.7/8; XXXVIII.4/3: *nadhīr,* LI.50,51; LIII. 56/57; VII.188). As they were preachers of good tidings, so is he a *mubashshir* (XXV.56/58; XVII.105/106; XXXIII.45/44) and a *bashīr* (XI.2; V.19/22; VII.188). As they have the office of witness *(shāhid),* so is he a witness from Allah (XI.17/20; XXXIII.45/44). As their coming was a mercy from Allah to mankind, so he is sent as a mercy (XXI.107). As they were sent in the language of the people to whom their mission was, so he is sent with a message in Arabic (XLIV.58; XVI.103/105). As they were told that their responsibility was to proclaim clearly their message, he is told the same thing (III.20/19; V.92/93; XIII.40; LXIV.12). As they brought Allah's commands, so did he (LXV.5). As they pointed to the dread of the coming Day of Judgment, so did he (XXXIX.71; VI.130). As men made mock of them and called them impostors, so they made mock of him (XV.95; XXI.41/42; XXV.41/43; V.57/62), and treated him as an impostor (VI.147/148; III.184/181; XXII. 42/43). As men disputed with them about their mission, so did they dispute with him (XXII.3,8,68/67; VI.25; VIII.6), and as men sought to lay violent hands on them, just so did they seek to do to him (XXII.72/71).

What, however, is of more interest to our present study is that the stories of the previous prophets, in whose succession he claims to stand, come to be accommodated to that same pattern. Vague and indefinite figures in the early Meccan passages, their stories gradually take form, and as they appear in his later preaching, they tend more and more to fall into a stylized pattern, viz. the pattern which he has as the background of his thought of his own mission.

The Prophets are *chosen* (XXII.75/74; XXVII.59/60), and so we read that Adam was chosen (XX.122/120), also Noah (III.33/30), Abraham (XVI.121/122; II.130/124), Jacob (XXXVIII.47), Joseph (XII.6), Jonah (LXVIII.50) and Moses (XX.13), while in the passage VI.84-87 Isaac, David, Solomon, Job, Aaron, Ishmael, Lot, Elijah, Elisha, Jesus, John Baptist and his father Zechariah are also enumerated as among those whom Allah chose.[1] Muḥammad is, of course, par excellence *al-Muṣṭafā.*

[1] Three different verbs are used for "to choose" in connection with Allah's messengers, viz. *ikhtāra, ijtabā* and *iṣṭafā,* but for the purposes of our discussion here they are synonymous and could each translate the Biblical *bākhar.* In the Qur'ān Allah's choosing is not confined to choosing the prophetic suc-

In a very special sense the Prophets are *guided* (XXXVI.21/20), and so we read of how Adam was guided (XX.122/120), as were Noah (VI.84), Abraham (XXVI.78; VI.80), Moses (XL.53/56), Isaac and Jacob (VI.84), and Jesus (V.46/50). To these the passage VI.84-86 adds Lot, David, Solomon, Job, Aaron, Ishmael, Jonah, Elijah, Elisha, John Baptist and his father Zechariah as those whom Allah guided to a straight path. Muḥammad also has this special guidance (XXXIV.50/49; XCIII.7).

As Allah's messengers they were given, as a special grace from their Lord, *bayyināt* (evidentiary signs) (III.183/180), and so we read how Noah had a *bayyina* (XI.28/30), as did Shu'aib (XI.88/90; VIII.85/83), and Hūd (IX.70/71), Ṣāliḥ (VII.73/71), Abraham and Lot (IX.70/71), Joseph (XL.34/36), Moses (XVII.101/103; II.92/86) and Jesus (II.87/81, 253/254). Muḥammad likewise came with *bayyināt* (LXI.6).

The Prophets were *faithful,* so we find this said of Noah (XXVI.107), of Hūd (VII.68/66; XXVI.125), of Abraham (LIII.37/38), of Lot (XXVI.162), of Elijah (XXXVII.132), of Ṣāliḥ (XXVI.143) and Shu'aib (XXVI.178), of Joseph (XII.54) and of Moses (XLIV.18/17; XXVIII.26). In the *Sīra* we read how Muḥammad was familiarly called by his fellow townsmen *al-Amīn,* "the Faithful" (Ibn Hishām, *Sīra,* p. 125).

In a peculiar sense the Prophets are the "righteous ones" *(Ṣāliḥūn),*[2] (XXVII.19; XXXVII.100/98; XII.101/102), so this title is found in connection with the stories of Idrīs (XXI.86), Noah (LXVI.10), Abraham (II.130/124; XVI.122/123); Lot (XXI.75; LXVI.10),[3] Ishmael (XXI.86), Isaac (XXXVII.112), Jacob (XXI.72), Joseph (XII.101/102), Jethro (XXVIII.27), Elijah (VI.85), Dhū'l-Kifl (XXI.86), Jonah (LXVIII.50), Solomon (XXVII.19), Jesus (VI.85; III.46/41), John Baptist (III. 39/34) and his father Zechariah (VI.85).

The messengers come *bi'l-ḥaqq,* "with the truth,"[4] (II.213/209; VII.43/41), an expression which is often used of Allah's revelation

---

cession. He chooses Saul to be king over Israel (II.247/248), and the Virgin Mary was "chosen" (III.42/37). This is consonant with Scriptural usage.

[2] This word, which Bell translates "upright," is also used of the faithful followers of a Prophet. Since the *ṣāliḥūn* of the Qur'ān obviously represent the *ṣaddīqīm* of the Old Testament, (the δίκαιοι of the Greek Bible), perhaps we should include here the title *ṣiddīq* given in the Qur'ān to Abraham (XIX.41/42), to Idrīs (XIX.56/57), to Joseph (XII.46), to the Virgin Mary (V.75/79), and used of certain faithful believers in IV.69/71; LVII.19/18. On the word see my *Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān,* pp. 194, 195.

[3] That Lot should be included among the righteous bespeaks Christian influence. It is only in very late Jewish documents that we find Lot included in such a fellowship, whereas as early as the Second Epistle of Peter (II.8) we find Lot referred to in Christian circles as ὁ δίκαιος.

[4] So the angelic messengers came *bi'l-ḥaqq* (XV.55,64).

(XLV.29/28; XLII.17/16; XXXIX.41/42; II.213/209), and which we find in connection with the mission of Abraham (XXI.55/56), Moses (II.71/66; XL.25/26), and David (XXXVIII.26/25). So Muḥammad is sent *bi'l-ḥaqq* (II.119/113; IV.170/168; XXIII.70/72; XXXV.-24/22; XXXVII.37/36).

That Prophets were sent as "warners" to warn their contemporaries, we have already seen (XLVI.21/20; LIV.5; XXXV.24/22). In particular this is said of Hūd (XXVI.136), of Ṣāliḥ (LIV.24, 25), of Noah (LXXI.2), of Lot (LIV.33), and of course of Muḥammad (X.2; VI.51; LXXIV.2). That they were bringers of good tidings is asserted in II.213/209; VI.48, and this is said in particular to have been the mission of Jesus (LXI.6) and of Muḥammad (XXV.56/58; XLVIII.8).

As Allah's messengers they can claim obedience, so we find Ṣāliḥ claiming such obedience (XXVI.144, 150), as do Hūd (XXVI.126, 131), Noah (LXXI.3; XXVI.110), Shu'aib (XXVI.179), Lot (XXVI.-163), Jesus (XLIII.63; III.50/44) and the anonymous messenger of XXIII.34/36. Similarly Muḥammad is to be obeyed (LXIV.12; VIII.-1, 20, 46/48; XLVII.33/35; III.32/29). But they are to ask no reward from men, an injunction that is laid on Ṣāliḥ (XXVI.145), Hūd (XI.-51/53; XXVI.127), Noah (XI.29/31; XXVI.109), Shu'aib (XXVI.-180) and Lot (XXVI.164), just as Muḥammad is to ask no reward of men (XXXVIII.86; XXIII.72/74; XXV.57/59; XII.104; XLII.23/22).

The Prophets were taunted with being merely men (XXXVI.-15/14; LXIV.6; XIV.10/12), and this occurred to Ṣāliḥ (XXVI.154), to Hūd (VII.69/67), to Noah (XI.27/29), to Shu'aib (XXVI.186), to Moses and Aaron (XXIII.47/49) and to the anonymous messenger in XXIII.33/34, 38/40. So this taunt was levelled against Muḥammad (XXI.3). It is not surprising, therefore, that the common experience of the Prophets was to be rejected by their people.[5] This was the experience of Noah (LIV.9; LXXI.5), of Ṣāliḥ (XCI.11), of Hūd (XI.-53/56), of Abraham (VI.80 ff.), of Lot (LIV.33, 36), of Moses (LXI.5), of the anonymous messenger (XXIII.33/34ff.) and of Jesus (III.-52/45). That it was the experience of Muḥammad when he preached at Mecca needs no elaboration.

The commonest charge against them was that they were impostors who must be given the lie (L.12, 13). This was the experience of Noah (LIV.9), of Hūd (XXVI.123, 139), of Shu'aib (XXIX.37/36), of Abraham (XXIX.18/17) and Lot (XXVI.160), of Moses and Aaron (XXIII.48/50), of Elijah (XXXVII.127) and of the anonymous messenger (XXIII.38/40). It was what happened to Muḥammad also

[5] It is because each Prophet is chosen from among his own people that they are commonly referred to as "their brother." This is said of Ṣāliḥ who was the "brother" of Thamūd (XXVII.45/46), of Hūd who is the "brother" of 'Ād (XI.50/52), of Shu'aib who is the "brother" of Midian (XXIX.36/35). So also Noah is the "brother" of his people (XXVI.106) and Lot of his (XXVI.161).

(VI.147/148; III.184/181; XXII.42/43). Sometimes they were considered as men bewitched. This was what they said of Noah (LIV.9; XXIII.25), of Ṣāliḥ (XXVI.153), of Shu'aib (XXVI.185), of Moses (XVII.101/103), and it was said of Muḥammad (XVII.47/50; XXV.-8/9). Sometimes they deemed them mad (LI.52), as they did Noah (LIV.9) Hūd (XI.54/57; VII.66/64) and Moses (LI.39), or accused them of sorcery (LI.52), as they did both Moses (LI.39) and Jesus (V.110) and also Muḥammad (XXXVIII.4/3). Sometimes their people go even further and plot against them to their harm, (XL.5; III.-183/180). This they did to Ṣāliḥ (XXVII.48/49 ff.); to Abraham (XXIX.24/23), to Moses (XL.26/27) and to Jesus (III.54/47; IV.-157/156; V.110). In like fashion they plotted against Muḥammad (XXII.72/71). Yet Allah's peace is with them, (XXXVII.181; XXVII.59/60). It was with Abraham (XXXVII.109), with Noah (XI.48/50; XXXVII.79/77), with Moses and Aaron (XXXVII.120), with Elijah (XXXVII.130), with Jesus (XIX.33/34) and with John Baptist (XIX.15). So the message of Muḥammad guides to the way of peace (V.15/18).

Allah's aid was ever available to assist His messengers. When they called on Him in their distress He answered them. He answered the call of Noah (XI.45/47; XXI.76), of Moses (XX.25/26), of Job (XXI.83; XXXVIII.41/40), of Jonah (XXI.87; LXVIII.48), of Zechariah (XIX.2; XXI.89), while Sūra XCIII recounts how Allah had come to the assistance of Muḥammad in his need. It is Allah also who grants them their gift of miracles when they are challenged to produce a sign in evidence of their calling. Ṣāliḥ was so challenged (XXVI.154), as were Hūd (XI.53/56), Shu'aib (XXVI.187) and Moses (VII.106/103), while Muḥammad was constantly so challenged (XXI.5; XX.133; XVII.90/92 ff.). So Ṣāliḥ was given his miraculous she-camel (XVII.59/61), Moses was given nine special signs (XVII.101/103) besides the signs of his rod and his hand (XX.-17/18ff.), the fire became cool so as not to burn Abraham (XXI.69), for David iron became tractable (XXXIV.10), to Solomon the winds were subject (XXXVIII.36/35) and also the birds (XXVII.16), Jesus miraculously healed the born blind and the leper and even raised the dead (III.49/43; V.110). Muḥammad's miracle is his Scripture, the Qur'ān.

It will already have been noticed that this pattern of the *Lives of the Prophets* draws its details almost as much from later legendary material as from the Scriptures of the People of the Book, though its general plan is Biblical. It is because Muḥammad is in their succession that he is bidden recount their stories (XV.51; XIX.16, 41/42, 51/52, 54/55, 56/57; XXXVIII.17/16, 41/40, 45, 48; X.71/72), and his claim is that Allah Himself recited to him their stories (XX.99; XI.120/121; XII.3; XXVIII.3/2; VII.101/99; III.58/51), for it was Allah who had

given the stories that were in the Scriptures of the *Ahl al-Kitāb*. That is, his Scripture was by revelation as earlier Scripture had been by revelation.

The outsanding feature in the mission of the Prophets, indeed, was that Allah had spoken to them by revelation. This is said of Adam (II.37/35), of Noah (XXIII.27), of Abraham (XXI.51/52; IV.163/161), of Ishmael (II.136/130; III.84/78; IV.163/161), of Isaac (XXI.73; IV.163/161), of Jacob (XXI.73; IV.163/161), of Job (IV.163/161), of Joseph (XII.15), of Moses (XX.13), of David (XXXVIII.29/28), of Solomon (IV.163/161), of Jesus (IV.163/161) and of John Baptist (XIX.12/13). In precisely similar fashion He is represented as speaking by revelation to Muḥammad (XXXVIII.70; XLIII.43/42; LXXII.1; XXI.45/46, 108; XVII.39/41, 73/75, 86/88; XVIII.27/26, 110; XII.102/103).

The two significant technical words in this connection are *nazzala* "to send down" (with its cognate *anzala* and its verbal noun *tanzīl*), and *awḥā* "to reveal," with the related noun *waḥy* "revelation."

The *nazzala* series offers no problem. Since the gods inhabit the heavens above any message from them to creatures on earth has obviously to be "sent down." So in ancient Mesopotamia a dream, an oracle or a command was "sent down" from gods to men.[6] In the Old Testament prophetic inspiration is by a coming down of Yahweh or His Spirit. The Lord "came down" to the place where Moses was to meet with Him and receive divine instructions (Numb.XI.17), but it was the spirit which "came upon" Baalam so that he prophesied (Numb.XXIV.2), upon Eldad and Modad to cause them to prophesy in the camp (Numb.XI.26-29), and upon Saul at his unexpected experience recorded in I Sam. X.6,10. The visions whereby Enoch had his revelations of the unseen "fell down" upon him (Eth.Enoch XIII.8). In the New Testament also it was the "descent of the Spirit" on the day of Pentecost which gave the apostles utterance (Acts II.1-4). In both Jewish and Christian literature of later times there is constant reference to this concept of "descent" in connection with revelation, but the notion was not confined to these two religions, for in *Yasna* XLIV.1 we read the prayer of Zoroaster—

> "so may the kindly Right his timely succour bring,
> And with heaven's Good Thought to usward in his gracious power descend."

When, therefore, we read in the Qur'ān that the Meccans deny that anything has been "sent down" by Allah (VI.91), we may assume that they were familiar, from their contacts with the People

[6] In Sumerian the compound verb a^2 . . . . . ag^2 means both "to send" and "to command," and the corresponding noun a^2–ag^2 (–ga^2) means "a message."

of the Book, with what Muḥammad meant when he referred to his message as a "missive" *(tanzīl)*,[7] or as something sent down (VI.114, *munazzal)*. Indeed we find this same verb used in the stories of the ancient Arab poets whose verses are likewise said to be "sent down" to them. Ḥassān b.Thābit, for example, tells how verses of weighty import were sent down to him from heaven in the night season. (*Dīwān*,ed.al-Barqūqī,Cairo,1929,p.335).

The situation with regard to the second term is somewhat more complicated; *awḥā* is Form IV of a verb *waḥā* "to indicate," "to signify," cognate with the Ethiopic *waḥāya*. Muḥammad does not use the simple form of the verb though his common word for "revelation," *waḥy*, is properly the verbal noun of this simple form.

awḥā is used in this primitive sense of "indicate" in XIX.11/12, where the afflicted Zechariah, who has been stricken dumb and cannot speak with his tongue, has to indicate by signs what is on his mind to say. Closely related to this is the meaning "to prompt," i.e., to give direction by an indication from within.[8] Thus Allah prompts Moses to cast down his staff that it may become a serpent (VII.117/114), prompts him to strike the rock to produce water (VII.160), prompts him to lead out the Israelites by night (XX. 77/79; XXVI.52), prompts him to smite the sea with his rod (XXVI.63), and prompts him and Aaron to make a *qibla* and appoint the prayer ritual (X.87). Likewise He prompted the mother of Moses to suckle the child (XXVIII.6), and later to send him forth in the ark (XX.38). Earlier He had prompted Isaac and Jacob to the doing of good deeds (XXI.73), and had prompted Noah to build the ark (XXIII.27). On the Day of Judgment He will prompt the Day to declare its news (XCIX.5). But it is not only Allah who thus directs by prompting from within, for Satans among Jinn and men may prompt each other to "tinsel speech" (VI.112). In the light of this we should probably interpret such a passage as XVI.123/124 as meaning that Allah prompted Muḥammad to follow the creed of Abraham, i.e., it was not so much an express revelation as an inner prompting such as those felt by Noah or Isaac and Jacob.

A little further development of this notion of an indication from within is that in which Allah is said to have taught the bee in this manner where to build its house (XVI.68/70), and at the creation of the seven heavens and seven earths He indicated to

---

[7] cf.LXIX.43; LVI.80/79; XX.4/3; XXVI.192; XLI.2/1; etc. In the Qur'ān *tanzīl* is used only for the messages sent down to Muḥammad, never for the message sent to any other prophet, though the verb is used of the message in the Torah and of that in the Gospel (III.3/2; IV.136/135, etc.).

[8] R. Bell in his translation of the Qur'ān always renders *awḥā* by the verb "to suggest," which will cover all the meanings, "to indicate," "to prompt," "to reveal."

each what its *'amr* should be (XLI.12/11). From this it is but one step further to the more technical meaning of "revelation." Allah indicates His will in this way of revelation to the angels (VIII.12), and angel messengers mediate His revealed will to men (XLII.51). This was the case with all His human messengers (XIV.13/16), so that these messengers are characterized as those to whom Allah has given revelation (XII.109; XVI.43/45; XXI.7). This was so distinguished an honor that it led to imitation, some to whom Allah had not spoken falsely claiming to have had divine revelation granted them (VI.93).[9] In IV.163/161 we have the statement that Allah spoke in this way to Noah and the prophets after him, to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac and Jacob, the Patriarchs (the Twelve), Jesus, Job, Jonah, Aaron and Solomon, as well as to Muḥammad himself. Besides these we read of such revelation being given to Joseph (XII.15), to Moses (XX.77/79; XXVI.63; VII.117/114), and to the disciples of Jesus (V.111).

That Allah is the source of this *waḥy* both to Muḥammad and to the various messengers who preceded him is expressly stated in XLII.3/1, and is implied in the claim of Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh to have received such a revelation (XX.48/50). Yet Allah is not the only source of *waḥy*. The Satans in precisely the same way give revelations to their clients by this indication from within (VI.121), though in their case it is probably thought of as on the level of prompting from within rather than on the higher level where revelation is connected with a mission from the Unseen and is involved with Scripture.[10]

When Muḥammad refers to his own reception of *waḥy* it is quite clear that he places his experience in this matter on the same level as that of those previous messengers whom he mentions in his preaching, (XXXIX.65; XLII.3/1; IV.163/161). Yet it is equally clear that his experience of *waḥy* belongs to both levels, that of prompting from within and that of revelation from without. When he feels the prompting to follow the creed of Abraham (XVI. 123/124), when he is inspired by a spirit of new religious interest (XLII.52), when he feels guided by what his Lord suggests to him (XXXIV.50/49; cf.VI.50,106; XLIII.43/42; X.109; XXXIII.2),

[9] Similarly in the Old Testament the false prophets are rebuked for claiming that God had spoken to them when He had not spoken (Jer.V.31; XIV.14; XXIII.21ff.; Mic.III.11), and the New Testament in its turn warns of the coming of such false prophets (Matt.VII.15; XXIV.11,24; Mk.XIII.22; I John IV.1).

[10] Perhaps this distinction should not be pressed. Mani, it will be remembered, was said to have taught that the Law and the Prophets were produced under the inspiration of the Evil Spirits (*Acta Archelai,* caps.x,xi-xiii,xxxix; Serapion of Thmuis *Adversus Manichaeos,* xxxvi; Titus of Bostra, *Contra Manichaeos,* III.5), so that it is not impossible that in Muḥammad's environment revelation even at the Scripture level may have been thought of as possible through Satanic inspiration.

when he fears lest he may be neglecting somewhat of that to which he feels the prompting (XI.12/15), when he is under the urge of the call to become one of the "warners" (XXXVIII.70; cf.XLVI. 9/8), this seems to be nothing particularly different from the inner prompting felt by the mother of Moses (XX.38; XXVIII.7/6), nor indeed from that instruction from within which directed the bee where to set up its house (XVI.68/70). When, however, he speaks of his particular messages as the product of *waḥy* (XXI.45/46; LIII.4; VII.203/202; VI.50; XLII.13/11; XVII.73/75; XIII.30/29; X.2), in particular the message concerning the uniqueness of Allah (XLI.6/5; XXI.108; XVIII.110), that message of monotheism which he says was revealed to each of the Prophets (XXI.25; XXXIX.65); when he asserts that it is a message that he cannot alter (X.15/16) seeing that it is God-given; when he learns by *waḥy* that the Jinn listened and believed (LXXII.1ff.), and feels that he has to be on his guard lest he be tempted to invent on his own (XVII.73/75), and run the risk of having Allah take away the gift of *waḥy* (XVII.86/88), then we are dealing with something not prompted from within but given from without.

On this second level *awḥā* is practically identical with *nazzala (anzala),* and it is in this sense of the word that revelation is associated with Scripture. He says of it that it is some of the eternal Wisdom which Allah has been pleased to reveal to him (XVII. 39/41), so that the regulations he lays down for the religious life of his community he can claim are revealed to him from the "Book", i.e., the heavenly archetype of Scripture (XXIX.45/44; cf. VI.145/146). Similarly the stories about ancient worthies and about Allah's judgment which he tells in his preaching, and says were given him by revelation (XI.49/51; XII.102/103; III.44/39), are doubtless meant to be understood as taken from the same source (XXXV.31/28). It is in this sense that he speaks of "Qur'ān" being given to him by *waḥy.*

> "We shall narrate to thee the best of narratives in revealing to thee this Qur'ān, even though thou wert before this one of the negligent" (XII.3).
>
> "And thus we have revealed to thee an Arabic Qur'ān[11] that thou mightest warn the Mother of Cities and those around it, and mightest warn of the Day of Assembling, about which there is no doubt. One party (will be) in the Garden and one party in the Blazing Fire" (XLII.7/5).

[11] *Qur'ān* in each of these passages means not the whole book which we know as the Qur'ān but rather "Scripture lesson," i.e., it has the original meaning of the Syriac word from which it is derived. Similarly the stories about the ancient worthies in the passages previously mentioned might each be taken as a Scripture lesson, for they are the stories of Noah (XI.49/51), of Joseph (XII. 102/103) and of the Virgin Mary (III.44/39).

"Say: Allah is a witness between me and you. And this Qur'ān has been revealed to me that by it I might warn you and whomsoever it may reach" (VI.19).

So he is bidden recite what has been put into his mind of the *Book* of his Lord (XVIII.27/26), and warned not to be too hasty in speaking till the revelation that is being given him is completed (XX.114/113).

When we ask, therefore, what was Muḥammad's conception of the mechanism whereby the material of Scripture was revealed, we have to deal with two conceptions which, for convenience of reference, we may label *inspiration* and *revelation,* the former being concerned with a prompting from within, and the latter with a bestowal from without. The former conception belongs mainly to the earlier stages of his prophetic activity and the latter to his later years.

The environment in which he spent his early years was one in which inspiration, as above defined, was well understood. Both poets and soothsayers *(kāhin)* in the Arabia of that day were known to produce their rhymed rhythmical utterances in response to an inner prompting. The popular explanation of this was that they were "possessed," and because of being possessed by a Jinni or a Shaiṭān who forced them to utter their proclamations they were considered to be more or less mad.[12] The interesting thing is that when Muḥammad came forward with his earliest public pronouncements his contemporaries immediately recognized them as akin to those of the soothsayers and poets (LII.29,30; XXI.5; LXIX.41,42) judging him to be Jinn-possessed, and therefore somewhat mad (LXVIII.51; LXXXI.22; XV.6; XXXVII.36/35; XLIV.14/13). It is not strange that they should have so judged. The *saj'* style of rhymed rhythmical prose used in Muḥammad's early pronouncements is hardly to be distinguished from that which we find preserved in the books of the later antiquarians as specimens of the pronouncements said to have come from the mouths of the ancient Arabian *kāhins.*[13] Moreover, the story preserved in the *Sīra* and

[12] Goldziher has gathered material on this in an essay "Ueber die Vorgeschichte der Higa-Poesie," in Bd. I of his *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie,* Leiden, 1896. It will be remembered that in quite another area we have the statement of Democritus that is is impossible to produce good poetry without an inspiration akin to madness, (Diels, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker,* II. 66).

[13] Specimens are given in al-Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-Bayān wa't-Tabyīn,* (Cairo, 1926), I,203; al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-A'shā,* I,211; al-Ibshīhī, *al-Mustaṭraf,* II,105. The lexicons say that this word *saj'* meant originally the prolonged yearning-cry of a female camel *(al-Ṣiḥāḥ,* sub.voc.), or the cooing of a pigeon (Lane,p. 1309), and then was applied by a figure to the utterances of the soothsayers. It is worthy of note that the cognate Heb. *meshuggā'* is used in connection with with the ecstatic utterances of the prophets (Hos.IX.7; II Ki.IX.11; Jer.XXIX. 26), and also in I Sam.XXI.14 (15) ff. for the kind of madness David simulated at the Court of Achish of Gath.

the *Ḥadīth* telling of his "first revelation," pictures him as experiencing precisely what a poet was thought to experience when inspiration seized him. We read there how the angel came unexpectedly upon him, bidding him proclaim what is dictated to him. He resisted, so the angel seized him and choked him[14] till he thought he would expire. This happened three times, till finally he submitted and recited at the angel's dictation (Ibn Hishām, *Sīra,pp.*152,153). Now we read of the poet Ḥassān b.Thābit, who later became a sort of Court poet to Muḥammad himself, that in his youth he had no thought of becoming a poet, but one day, in the streets of Madina, a female Si'lāt-demon cast herself upon him, knelt on his chest, struggling with him and threatening to kill him, till she finally forced three verses out of him and started him on his career as a poet. (Suyūṭī,*al-Muzhir,*II,247).

Ibn Hishām was writing when the theory of angel mediation of all revelation was the orthodox theory, and so the choking is done in his story by an angel. Muḥammad himself, however, would seem at first to have feared that his experience was a case of Jinn-possession which had come upon him as suddenly and as unexpectedly as the coming of the Si'lāt-demon on Ḥassān b.Thābit. In the earliest account we have of this experience of his[15] we read that it left him in a terror of apprehension lest it should mean that he was possessed, so that he even contemplated suicide[16] by casting himself down from the mountain side. Hurrying home to Khadīja he buried his head in her lap, and to her inquiry as to what had happened he said: "He of whom no one would ever have believed it has become a poet or one Jinn-possessed." But Khadīja comforted him, assuring him that Allah would never permit such a thing to happen to a person of his reputation, one who ever spoke the truth,

---

[14] "Choked" is perhaps the best word to use here. Ibn Hishām has the verb *ghatta,* but al-Bukhārī *Ṣaḥīḥ* I, 5 has *ghaṭṭa* with *ṭ* instead of *t*. Both verbs have the meaning "to plunge deep into water," though *ghaṭṭa* is used also of the gurgling sound of a cooking-pot. Ibn al-Athīr, *Nihāya,* III, 168 says that both words mean the same thing, and suggests that we are to understand a choking for breath.

[15] It is quoted from the early biography of Ibn Isḥāq by Ṭabarī, *Annales,* I,1150ff. In the bowdlerized edition of Ibn Hishām the account of Muḥammad's fear and a considerable part of Khadīja's words of comfort have been omitted. The story was known, however, to the canonical Traditionists, (cf. al-Bukhārī I.5; IV.347), though there also considerations of reverence for the Prophet have caused the deletion of all reference to his particular fear and to the thoughts of suicide. Sprenger, *Leben,* I,336-339, translates the whole passage from his copy of Ṭabarī. The pleasant tale told in the *Sīra* of Ibn Hishām of how Khadīja thought out a device to prove whether Muḥammad's visitor from the Unseen were demonic or angelic obviously arose after the identification of the source of revelation with Gabriel had been made.

[16] The thought of suicide is seen by some writers in such Qur'ānic passages as XVIII.6/5; XXVI.3/2, but these passages must in any case refer to events later in his ministry, and have no relevance to this "first revelation."

returned not evil for evil, kept faith with his fellows, lived a good life and was always kind to relatives and friends. She then questioned him more closely, the story goes on to say, about the portentous thing which had terrified him, and when he told her about it she first gave him a word of cheer, suggesting that this experience might be something quite other than what he feared, and then sought counsel from her cousin Waraqa b.Naufal. This Waraqa, who was well acquainted with the People of the Book and with their Scriptures, immediately recognized that this experience of Muḥammad was the same as was told of in those Books in connection with the descent of the *Nāmūs* which came down upon Moses.

Though the tendential character of this story about Waraqa is quite obvious it may well embody a memory of the transition in Muḥammad's own thought from the concept of *inspiration* to that of *revelation.* The idea of *inspiration* belonged to the environment of his childhood and youth, the idea of *revelation* was something learned from fuller contact with the People of the Book. The Qur'ān itself shows how he needed assurance that he was not mad (LXVIII.2). Perhaps those biographers are right who think that Muḥammad had begun to produce "effusions" such as those we now have in Sūras CVI,CV,LXXXVI.1-10; LXXXVII.1-9; C; XCIII; XCIV; CIII etc., before the great experience that gave him his call to his mission.[17] That would mean that he had two experiences,[18] the first which was much the same as the experience of a poet or a *kāhin,* and then the great experience which convinced him that he had something more than just the message of a *kāhin.* It is then that he insists that his message is not something spoken out of mere impulse (LIII.3). He knows well that the Satans inspire wicked, lying persons and poets (XXVI.221-224), but declares that this message of his is not the word of a poet (LXIX.41), is not something the Satans have heard and have brought down (XXVI. 210-212). It was from contact with the People of the Book that he had learned the distinction, so that the story about Waraqa may preserve a memory of this fact. Muḥammad knows that other messengers before him among the communities known to the People of the Book had been considered by their contemporaries as Jinn-possessed madmen. In particular he refers to this charge as levelled against Noah (LIV.9), and against Moses (XXVI.27/26; LI.39), just as the Rabbinic tales tell of the mockery made of Noah's mad-

[17] Wm. Muir, *Life of Mohammed,* (Edinburgh, 1912), p. 42.

[18] Sūra LIII.1-18 distinctly mentions two experiences of visitation from the Unseen. This double "calling" is met with elsewhere in that area. It will be remembered that the angelic being visited Mani when he was just emerging out of childhood to teach him how to prepare for his mission, and then came and "called" him again when it was time for his mission to commence (*Fihrist,* p. 328).

ness in building such a thing as the Ark,[19] and of the three occasions when the Israelites made protest at the madness of Moses' command to them,[20] when he led them into the waters of the Red Sea, when he took them into the waterless wilderness, and when, in spite of the report of the spies, he insisted that they march into the land of Canaan. In LI.52 he says that no messenger had ever come to any people in earlier times without their having called him either a madman or a sorcerer, which reminds one of the popular judgment on the prophets in Hos.IX.7:

"the prophet is a fool: the man of the spirit is mad."

It will be remembered how Shemaiah the Nehelemite wrote to Zephaniah the son of Maaseiah the priest reminding him of his duty to punish with prison and the stocks "every man that is mad and maketh himself a prophet" (Jer.XXIX.25-27). Likewise in the New Testament we find that the contemporaries of Jesus reacted to his preaching by saying: "He hath a devil and is mad. Why hear ye him?" (Jno.X.20), and even his friends are represented as having at one time thought that he was ἐξέστη "beside himself" (Mk.III.21 ff.).[21]

But not all prophetic experience was on this level. In every case it was concerned with a breaking through of the Unseen with a message to be delivered. That message might be nothing more than information about the whereabouts of someone's stray asses (I Sam. IX.6 ff.), or it might be a matter of oracles of blessing and cursing (Numb.XXIII,XXIV), or a prediction of coming woe (Jonah III.4), but it might be on the level of the impassioned utterances of an Amos or a Jeremiah. If the Prophet were a true prophet it was always a message from God, however humble a matter it might seem in our judgment. It might be the Holy One Himself who broke through from the Unseen and without any intermediary gave the message. He spoke with Adam in the earthly Paradise (Gen.III.8 ff.). He spoke personally to Abraham when He called him to go out on his great venture of faith (Gen.XXIV.7). He spoke with Moses

---

[19] *Lekach Tob,* ed. Buber, p. 36; *Midrash Tanḥuma* § Noah; and cf. *Book of the Bee,* XX.

[20] In the Qur'ān, however, it is Pharaoh who brands Moses as mad.

[21] This N.T. word ἐξίστημι "to throw out of position" fits well with what the Qur'ān says of the reception of the Prophet Hūd by his people, for they said that it was clear that one of the gods must have smitten him (XI.54/57), and this throwing him off his balance was the cause of his *safāha* "craziness" (VII.66/64). Here we are reminded at once of Homer's picture of Hector, smitten by the god Ares, rushing with foaming mouth and blazing eyes towards the Greek ships (*Iliad* XV.605), and of the smitten Cassandra in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus who cries (ll.1214-1216):

"Oh! Oh! the agony!
Once more the dreadful throes of prophesy
Whirl and distract me with their ill-boding onset."

at the bush (Ex.III.4ff.), with Samuel at Shiloh (I Sam.III.4-14), and with David about the Jerusalem temple (I Ki.V.5). More commonly, however, it was by the Spirit as intermediary that He spoke. It was the spirit which came upon Gideon to give him guidance in the days of the struggle against the Midianites and the Amalekites (Judg.VI.34), which came upon Samson to move him (Judg.XIII. 25; XIV.6,19), and upon Saul to make him prophesy (I Sam.X.6,10; XVIII.10), just as later it came upon the writing prophets to give them their message (Isa.LXI.1; Ezek.XI.5). This Spirit is the Holy Spirit which the Psalmist pleads may not be taken away (Ps.LI.11), and which inspired Moses during the carrying out of his mission (Isa.LXIII.10,11). That it was the special agent of prophecy appears quite clearly in the story of how Moses appointed the seventy elders (Numb.XI.25), where we read how the Lord took of the Spirit which was already upon Moses and gave it to these seventy elders whom Moses had chosen, whereupon, as soon as it rested upon them, they began to prophesy.[22]

Muḥammad knows that it is the Spirit who is the agent of revelation. He tells his audience that Allah sends down His Spirit upon whom He wills among His servants that he may undertake the task of warning (XL.15; XVI.2). Consequently it is this Spirit who brings down Muḥammad's message from the Lord (XVI.102/104; XXVI.193ff.; XLII.52), that he also may warn (XXVI.194).

The word he uses here for "Spirit" is *rūḥ*, which, of course, is the Heb. *rūaḥ*, Aram. *ruḥā* of the Old Testament and the Rabbinic writings, which like the Syr. *rūḥā*, representing the πνεῦμα of the New Testament, is the word that is always used of the spirit which is active in connection with the inspiration of men of God. In XL.15; XVI.2 and XLII.52 this spirit is said to be *min'amrihi* (or *min'amrinā*), which may mean no more than that it is connected with Allah's affairs, as Bell translates it. If, however, as has been more than once suggested,[23] it represents the Rabbinic *mēmrā*, it is curious to note, i) that in IV.171/169 Jesus is referred to as "a spirit from Him *(minhu)*,"[24] ii) that on the Day the Spirit will stand[25] apart from, yet with, the angels (LXXVIII.38); iii) that the Spirit along with the angels is concerned with every *'amr* "affair" (XCVII.4).

In his Meccan period Muḥammad is conscious that he knows

---

[22] In Deut. XXXIV.9 we read that the spirit of wisdom which Joshua had was passed on to him from Moses.

[23] Grimme, *Mohammed*, II, p. 51; Hirschfeld, *New Researches*, p. 15.

[24] This Spirit of Allah was breathed into Mary (XXI.91; LXVI.12), just as Allah's spirit was breathed into Adam (XV.29; XXXVIII.72, XXXII.9/8).

[25] So in LXX.4 the Spirit is distinguished from and yet functions along with the angels.

very little about the Spirit (XVII.85/87), save that it has some connection with Allah's *'amr,* and is angelic in nature. Later on he identifies it with the Holy Spirit (*rūḥ al-Qudus,* XVI.102/104), which (or who) was the strengthener of Jesus (II.87/81,253/254; V.110/109). The reason is clear. In the Old Testament it is, as we have seen, the "spirit" which is the agent in mediating the prophetic message. Yet often enough in the Old Testament it is a special angelic visitant who speaks with the prophets. It was such an angel of the Lord who spoke with Hagar and the child Ishmael in the wilderness (Gen.XVI), who spoke with Abraham at the test of sacrificing Isaac (Gen.XXII.11ff.), who spoke to Balaam (Numb.XXII. 35),[26] to Gad (I Chron.XXI.18), to Elijah (II Ki.I.3) and to Zechariah (Zech.I.9ff.). In the Book of Daniel this angel is identified with Gabriel (IX.21ff.), and it is Gabriel who in the Gospel is the messenger from the Lord to announce the birth both of John the Baptist and of Jesus (Lk.I.19,26). In Sūra XIX.17 it was Allah's Spirit who made the announcement to Mary, so that we have the ground for the identification of the Spirit with Gabriel, and are prepared for II.97/91 where it is Gabriel who brings down the message to Muḥammad's heart,[27] and LXVI.4 where he is Muḥammad's angelic patron.

In the later theological tractates it is Gabriel who, as the angel of revelation, is entrusted with the task of transmitting from the heavenly archetype of Scripture the message that was given to each Prophet as he appeared to undertake his mission, and it was Gabriel who for the twenty odd years of Muḥammad's prophetic activity visited him from time to time to transmit to him the "words of Allah" he was to proclaim in his preaching and leave as his Scripture for his community. This particular association of Gabriel with the matter of revelation is peculiar to Islam,[28] but there can be little doubt that it was suggested by the activity of Gabriel in delivering messages from heaven as pictured in the Book of Daniel and the Gospel of Luke. Some steps in this direction had been taken already in the Rabbinic writings, where pious fancy had seen Gabriel in

[26] It is perhaps worth remembering that where in the Hebrew text of these chapters of Numbers it is an angel who speaks to Balaam, in the Aramaic Targums it is a *Memrā* from God who meets Baalam in the way.

[27] Thus the "faithful spirit" of XXVI.193 is identified with Gabriel, likewise the "one strong in power" of LIII.5, and the "noble messenger" of LXXXI.19 (unless the noble messenger here refers to Muḥammad himself, as in LXIX.40). It will be noticed that the phrase "beside Him of the Throne established" in LXXXI.20 is much the same as Gabriel says of himself in Lk.I.19 ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, a phrase to which Strack-Billerbeck II,97 bring Rabbinic parallels.

[28] It is common to both Sunnī and Shī'a Islam. For the Shī'a doctrine see Ibn Bābawaihi as translated by A. A. Fyzee, *A Shi'ite Creed,* pp.82,83.

the messenger who in Gen.XXVII.15 showed the way to Joseph,[29] taught him the seventy languages (*Sota* 36b), and cared for and instructed Moses in Egypt (*Exod. R.*i,67b).

Having come thus far in our discussion we are in a position to answer the question of how Muḥammad conceived the mechanism of revelation whereby Scripture became available to men. In Sūra VI.93 we read—

> "Who has done greater wrong than he who has invented a falsehood about Allah, or says: 'I have received a revelation,' when nothing has been revealed to him; and he who says: 'I shall have sent down (to me) the like of what Allah has sent down'?"

and again in XLII.51/50 we read—

> "It is not for a human that Allah should speak to him save by *waḥy,* or from behind a veil, or should send a messenger to reveal by His permission what He wills . . . . . and thus have We revealed to thee a spirit *(rūḥ)* from Our affair *('amr),* for thou didst not know what Scripture *(kitāb)* or Faith *('īmān)* was. But We have made it a light to guide whom We will of Our servants, and thou, indeed, wilt guide to a straight path."

In these two passages we have all the essential elements. Scripture is necessary that men may be rightly guided (VI.157/158; III.4/2) to that "straight path," may know and understand the "way of God" they could never have found by the exercise of their own intelligence. To know and walk this way is to walk in the safety of true religion, to be in the Faith. It is the function of Scripture to record what Allah has been pleased to reveal about this Faith. The initiative in the matter is with Allah. He could have left men without guidance, but in His mercy He has at various points in history chosen humans to whom He has revealed messages which He wished them to set forth as guidance for their fellows. These chosen servants are His messengers, His prophets, and so significant is their office that evil-minded men will falsely pretend to have also had such a revelation for human guidance. No greater wrong than this can be conceived, for instead of guiding men such pretenders would be leading them astray from the "straight path." There are three ways in which Allah can convey such a message to His chosen messenger.

(1) He may speak with him in personal converse at a personal interview, when there is naught but the Veil between Allah and His Servant (II.253/254). It was thus that He spoke with Moses (IV.164/162; VII.144/141),[30] and thus did He speak with Muḥam-

[29] Targ.Yer.I on the passage.

[30] The reference is to the theophany at Sinai (Ex.XIX.20).

mad on the famous night of the *Mi'rāj* or Heavenly Journey.[31] Perhaps we are also meant to understand that He spoke thus with Adam in personal converse in the Garden (II.31/29-37/35).[32]

(2) Or He may speak by *waḥy*, giving inspiration from within much as He inspires the bees in the matter of house building, or inspires the heavens and the earth as to their cosmic functions. In manner this is not very different from the way in which the poets and soothsayers are inspired, though in the case of Allah's messengers the source is divine not demonic and the material given is heavenly instruction.

(3) Or He may send a celestial messenger. There seems to have been some confusion at first in Muḥammad's mind as to whether this was just any angel or a special celestial being. Later he identifies this messenger with the Holy Spirit, and finally with Gabriel.

In all this we are dealing with matters commonly discussed among those People of the Book with whom Muḥammad was in contact during his formative period. Among them all three methods were associated with God's revelation of Himself to men. He spoke directly to Adam and Eve in the Garden (Gen.III), and He spoke to Moses (Ex.XXXIV.34)[33] both at the Bush (Ex.III,IV) and at Sinai (Ex.XIX), as well as to others among His servants such as Abraham (Gen.XXVI.2), Jacob (Gen.XXXV.15) and David (I Ki.VI.12). At a later period reverence for the Divine introduced the notion of the Veil that hung between the Divine Presence and creatures who drew near.[34] But God also prompted from within those servants whom He sent, thus giving them what they were assured was the word of the Lord. Ezekiel says of his experience—

> "Then the spirit entered into me, and set me upon my feet, and spake with me, and said unto me, Go, shut thyself within thy house . . . . . but when I speak with thee, I will open thy mouth, and thou shalt say unto them: Thus saith the Lord God. He that heareth let him hear," (Ezek.III.24,27).

And the Lord also sent His angels with His heavenly message to

---

[31] See *Ḥāshiyat al-Dardīr 'alā Qiṣṣat al-Mi'rāj*, pp.22,23.

[32] The older Commentators on the passage II.253/254, e.g., al-Baiḍāwī, mention only Moses and Muḥammad as those to whom Allah spoke face to face. Later writers, however, such as al-Alūsī, *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* III,2, and al-Khafājī, *'Ināyat al-Qāḍī*, II.332, add Adam to them.

[33] The New Testament writers also note this, cf.Mk.XII.26; Jno.IX,29.

[34] The Qur'ānic *ḥijāb* corresponds to the *wīlōn* and the *pargōd* of the Rabbinic texts (*Hag.*13a; *Gen.R.*iii,4; *Lev.R.*xxxi,7; *Midrash Tehillim* at end of Ps.XI; III Enoch XLV,1,6), the *bar gōda* of the Mandaean texts, and the καταπέτασμα of the early Christian and Gnostic tractates (see the Index to Miss Baynes' *Coptic Gnostic Treatises*, p.197). This same word *ḥijāb* is used for the veil before the Presence in the Arabic text of the Samaritan *Molad Mosheh* (ed. S. Miller, p.133).

His servants. He so sent His message to Gideon (Judg.VI.11ff.), to Manoah (Judg.XIII.3ff.), to Abraham and Lot (Gen.XVIII.XIX), to Elijah (I Ki.XIX.5ff.), to the unnamed prophet of Bethel (I Ki.XIII. 18), and we read in the Gospel that when a heavenly voice answered the cry of Jesus the people said: "An angel hath spoken to him" (Jno. XII.29). That there was understood to be a connection between the angelic messengers and the moving of the spirit is quite clear both in Judg. XIII.20-25 and Luke I.13-17. Finally in Daniel and in the Gospel of Luke the angelic messenger is named Gabriel, so that in later writings there is a strong tendency to identify the celestial being who appears in the Old Testament theophanies with Gabriel.[35]

There is thus no escape from the conclusion that though Muḥammad began with a concept of inspiration hardly, if at all, distinguishable from that of the poets and soothsayers in the Arabia of his day, yet as he developed his interpretation of his mission to bring to the Arabs the content of the religion of the People of the Book his thinking expanded from this limited concept of *inspiration* to a fuller concept of *revelation* connected with a Scripture. In this development of his thinking[36] it is now clear that he took over from the People of the Book a theory of the mechanism of revelation as well as a theory of the nature of Scripture and a theory of the prophetic succession through which that Scripture was communicated to Allah's creatures.

Since Muḥammad thought of himself as in the succession of these men sent of God, and since the Qu'ān as a revelation to him from Allah was to take its place beside previous Scriptures, it is of some importance to consider what the Qu'ān has to say about these previous Scriptures.

In his thinking about the messengers it was part of the office of a messenger to be sent with Scripture (LVII.25; XVI.36/38; XL.70/72; X.47/48; XXXV.25/23; III.184/181),[37] and in V.44/48 we read that the function of doctors and teachers among the people was to guard Scripture. The necessity for such guarding is obvious. Scripture is the ultimate authority in matters of religion,[38] given that men may be rightly guided (XXIII.49/51:VI.157/158), and so

---

[35] The evidence for this is assembled in Strack-Billerbeck II,91.

[36] It is significant that in XXVIII.86 we have the statement that he had had no expectation that Scripture would ever be given him, cf. in this connection also XXIX.48/47.

[37] In this connection we may also note II.213/209 which states that whenever Allah sent a Prophet He sent him with Scripture, and remind ourselves that in connection with the *covenant* with the Prophets III.81/75 regards the giving of Scripture and Wisdom as part of Allah's Covenant obligation.

[38] Cf. the oft repeated taunt at the Meccans that they can produce no Scriptural authority for their religious ideas and practices (XXXVII.157; LXVIII.37; XXXIV.44/43).

something over which men should meditate, and which the intelligent should ever keep in mind (XXXVIII.29/28). It is not strange, therefore that belief in Scriptures sent from Allah should be laid down as a fundamental belief for Muḥammad's followers (II. 177/172; IV.136/135). But ultimately all Scripture is one, for there was one archetypal Book of which the Scriptures of the various Prophets were but portions (XVIII.27/26; III.23/22; II.231; XXXIII.6; XXIX.45/44; XXXV.31/28;IV.44/47,51/54). Therefore Muslims are to believe in the entire Book (III.119/115;cf.V.59/64), as Muḥammad himself was bidden believe in whatever Scripture Allah had sent down (XLII.15/14).

What then does the Qur'ān have to say about these portions of the archetypal Scripture which were sent down to his predecessors, and in which he and they are to believe? In XIII.38 we read that each age had its Scripture,[39] but in VI.156/157 the Arabs seem to know that Scripture has been sent down to only two previous peoples, an idea which would fit in very well with passages we have already considered, such as II.136/130; LVII.26; IV.54/57, which suggest that the receiving of Scripture was a matter confined to the two groups of the *Ahl al-Kitāb*.[40] Thus the regulation for Muslims is that they believe in what was sent down to the People of the Book (XXIX.46/45; II.4/3; IV.136/135;cf.XLII.13/11;V.59/64). This assumes that they were in a position to discover what was in those previous Scriptures, just as the injunction to Muḥammad to consult those who read Scripture when he is in doubt about what is being revealed to him (X.94) assumes that such Scripture readers were readily available. Yet the only Scriptures mentioned by name in the Qur'ān, apart from two early references to the Scrolls (*ṣuḥuf*) of Abraham and Moses (LXXXVII.19; LIII.36/37,37/38), whose meaning is doubtful,[41] are the *Taurah* of Moses, the *Zabūr* of David and the *Injīl* of Jesus.

i) Of the *Taurah* we read that it was "sent down" like other revelation material (III.3/2,65/58,93/87; V.44/48 etc.), to be the

---

[39] When in XLV.28/27 it says that on the Day every nation will be summoned to its own Book, this might seem to carry out this idea that each group will have to give an accounting of its response to the Scripture sent for its guidance. *Kitāb* in this verse, however, may not mean Scripture, but may refer to the Record Book in which the records of nations as well as of individuals are written.

[40] This is the strongest argument in favour of the idea that such messengers as Hūd, Ṣāliḥ, Shu'aib must be meant to represent Old Testament characters.

[41] If it is insisted that these *ṣuhuf* must have been writings circulating under the names of Moses and Abraham, one can only suggest that the reference may be to some such works as the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the *Apocalypse of Moses*, or the *Testament of Abraham* and the *Testament of Moses*. In XX.133, however, *aṣ-ṣuḥuf al-'ūlā* apparently means nothing more than "previous Scriptures," so that the reference in LXXXVII.19 and LIII.37/38ff. may be merely to the Old Testament Scriptures.

Scripture for the Children of Israel (XLV,16/15; XL.53/56; II.41/38,44/41), giving them Allah's guidance (XVII.2; XXXII.23; XL.53/56). It was later than the time of Abraham (III.65/58), and is specifically the Book of Moses (XI.17/20; XLVI.12/11),[42] though Aaron's name is associated with his in this matter (XXI.48/49; XXXVII.117). It is described as a light and a warning to the God-fearing (XXI.48/49;cf.XL.54/56), for it was given for men's enlightenment (XXVIII.43). It is called an *Imām* (XI.17/20;XLVI. 12/11) and a mercy (VI.154/155; XI.17/20; XLVI.12/11), a *dhikrā* (XL.54/56), a light (VI.91;V.44/48) and a guidance (VI.91,154/155; V.44/48).[43] It contains the *ḥukm* of Allah (V.43/47), is a *tafṣīl*[44] of every matter (VI.154/155;VII.145/142), teaching the Children of Israel much that neither they nor their fathers knew (VI.91). It is a completion (*tamām*) for everyone who would do right (VI. 154/155), and contains Allah's pledged promise of Paradise for such as will devote their persons and their substance to Him (IX. 111/112). Nevertheless it is but a portion of the *Kitāb* of Allah (V.44/48). In particular it contained the Law for the Children of Israel, for it was the Taurah which contained the law of retaliation (V.45/49), the food regulations they had to observe (III.93/87), the prohibition of usury (IV.161/159;V.42/46), etc.[45] It is doubtless what is meant by the Tablets written out by Allah for Moses,[46] since they also are called a guidance and a mercy, a monition concerning all things which Moses is to command the people to observe (VII.145/142, 154/153).

After the time of Moses this Taurah was inherited by the Prophets among the Children of Israel who judged the people according to it (V.44/48). Later Allah taught it to Jesus (III.48/43) for Jesus came to confirm it (LXI.6;III.50/44; V.46/50) as it was read and studied by his contemporaries (III.79/73). Later still it was inherited by the doctors and teachers of the Jews,[47] who were its keepers and witnesses to it, and who judged the people of their

---

[42] So we are to understand that the *Taurah* is meant in numerous passages such as XXIII.49/51; XXV.35/37; XVII.2 etc. which speak of the Book that was given to Moses.

[43] Possibly it is meant by "the truth" in VII.159.

[44] Bell translates *tafṣīl* as "a clear setting forth." It is said of the Qur'ān in X.37/38 and XII.111.

[45] XVI.118/119 says that Allah had told Muḥammad about the things He had made forbidden to the Jews, where the reference would be to the Torah.

[46] In later Rabbinic teaching the Tablets given to Moses at Sinai contained not merely the Ten Commandments but the whole Torah. See on this Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews,* III.97,197; VI.60.

[47] The words he uses here are two technical words of Jewish origin, *rabbānīyūn* and *aḥbār,* the plurals of *Rabbān* and *Ḥibr,* both derived from words in common use among the Jews for their teachers. See *Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān,* pp.137 and 49.

community according to it (V.44/48). Finally it came down to the Jews of Arabia, Muḥammad's contemporaries, who had copies which he challenged them to bring out and read (III.93/87), for he claimed that in it was a word-picture of the perfect Muslim (XLVIII.29), a teaching with regard to that Day of Meeting about which the Arabs laughed when he preached of it (VI.154/155), and a description of himself as the expected Prophet (VII.157/156). His Jewish contemporaries used to read in it (II.44/41,75/70ff.;V.43/47; VII.169/168), knowing that it was something revealed from the Lord (II.76/71), but obstinately they say that they will believe in it but in nothing that has come after it (II.91/85). Sūra V.45/49 quotes Exod.XXI.23-27, and it is possible that parts of V.32/35 and XVII.2,4,7 are meant to be quotations from the Taurah.

ii) The *Zabūr* was the Book given to David (XVII.55/57; I.163/161), a "blessed Book" sent down to him (XXXVIII.29/28), since he was one of Abraham's rightly-guided progeny (VI.84,87) and thus among those to whom Allah gave the gifts of Scripture, Wisdom and Prophecy (VI.89). As such he was taught by Allah (II.251/252). The Zabūr is actually quoted in Sūra XXI.105, where the words "My righteous servants shall inherit the earth" is a quotation from Ps.XXXVII.29. When Sūra V.78/82 says that the unbelieving among the Jews were cursed by the tongue of David this may possibly be a reference to certain imprecatory Psalms, though it is more likely to be a generalization.

iii) The *Injīl* is the revelation given to Jesus, who was taught it by Allah (III.48/43; LVII.27; V.46/50). Like other Scriptures it was "sent down" (III.65/58; V.47/51), and like them it was intended to give guidance and light (V.46/50; cf.III.3/2),[48] and to give warning (V.46/50). It agrees with the Taurah in giving a word-picture of the perfect Muslim (XLVIII.29), in containing Allah's pledged promise of Paradise (IX.111/112), and in having in it a description of Muḥammad as the coming Prophet (VII. 157/156).[49] This agreement is not strange since it was intended as a confirmation of the Taurah (V.46/50). From Jesus the disciples received it and believed in it (III.53/46), and the Christians are to judge according to it (V.47/51).

In each case, it will have been noticed, the Scripture is thought of as a body of material given from without to one individual.

---

[48] Thus it may be the Gospel that is meant by the "enlightening Book" in XXXV.25/23.

[49] Since in this passage Allah is speaking to Moses this is a reference to a Book not yet in existence among men, unless we are to believe, as has sometimes been suggested, that Muḥammad at one time believed that Moses and Jesus were roughly contemporary, and only later learned that Jesus was a much later prophet.

Moreover the Injīl is thought of as, like the Taurah, something to be observed, being thus the Law for the Christian community as the Torah was the Law for the Jews. The names used for these three Scriptures are words borrowed from the religious vocabulary of the *Ahl al-Kitāb*. Taurah is the Heb. *Tōrāh*, meaning "instruction," which among the Jews early came to be used as a technical term for the Law (ὁ νόμος),[50] and by extension for the whole of the Old Testament.[51] *Zabūr* is an Arabic corruption of the Hebrew word *mizmōr*,[52] doubtless under the influence of the genuine Arabic word *zubur*. *Injil* is ἐναγγέλιον, but passed on to Arabic through the Ethiopic *wangēl*.[53] Both the names Muḥammad uses for his own "lessons" of Scripture are likewise words taken from the technical religious vocabulary of the People of the Book, *Qur'ān* being the Syriac *qeryānā*, used in the Syriac speaking Church for the "readings" used as Scripture lessons,[54] and *Sūra* being a distortion of another Syriac word.[55] The more general word for Scripture, viz. *Kitāb* was also derived from the same source,[56] as was the word *furqān* which in II.53/50; XXI.48/49 is associated with Moses, in III.4/2 with both the Taurah and the Injīl, and in XXV.1; II. 185/181 with the revelation to Muḥammad.[57]

It is not surprising therefore to see how closely Muḥammad's thought of his own Book follows this picture he had formed from what he had learned about the Scriptures of the *Ahl al-Kitāb*. Like them his Scripture is derived from the celestial archetype (XLIII. 4/3; LVI.78/77ff.; and cf. LII.2,3; XVIII.27/26), from which, like them, it is "sent down" (LVI.80/79; XLIV.3/2; XCVII.1; II. 185/181; XXVI.192; XXXIX.1; XX.4/3), though it also consists of only portions of that divine original (XXIX.45/44; XXXV.31/28). It was brought down, as they were, by angelic mediation (XXVI. 193; XVI.102/104). Thus it is truly *waḥy* (LIII.4). Its message, like theirs, is something taught by the Merciful One Himself (LV.1ff.),[58] so it is a book of warning (X.57/58; XXVI.194; XXV.1; XXXII.3/2;

---

[50] Since ὁ νόμος was given to Moses (cf.Jno.I.17) this is doubtless the origin of the *Nāmūs* in the Waraqa story already mentioned.

[51] Isaiah is quoted as the Law in I Cor.XIV.21, and the Psalms similarly in Jno.X,34; cf. also Jno.XII.34; XV,25; IV Ezra XIV.21, and the Talmudic passages *Sanh*.91 b, and *Mo'ed Katon* 5a.

[52] See *Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān*, p.149.

[53] *Ibid.* p.72.

[54] *Ibid.* p.234.

[55] In *Foreign Vocabulary*, p.182 I favored the derivation from *sūrtā* "writing," but scholars now seem more inclined to think that it is a corruption of *sbartā*, "preaching."

[56] *Ibid.* p.249.

[57] *Ibid.* pp.225-229.

[58] That it was "from the Lord of the Worlds" is often emphasised (XXVI.192; XXXII.2/1; X.37/38).

XXXVI.70), as well as of good tidings (XXVII.2;II.97/91; XVI. 89/91,102/104). Like its predecessors it is a mercy (XXVII.77/79; XLV.20/19; XVI.64/66,89/91), and a light (XLII.52; LXI.8; IV.174), to give men guidance (LXXII.13; XVII.9; XXVII.2; II.97/91; XVI.89/91,102/104; XII.111), leading them out of darkness into light (XIV.1) and into the paths of Allah (XIV.1; XXXIV.6). It contains Allah's command (LXV.4,5,8), so that like the earlier Scriptures it is a book of Law, containing Allah's legal prescription (*farīḍa,* IV.11/12,24/28;IX.60), His ordinance (*waṣiyya,* IV.12/16), His precepts (*ḥūdūd,* IV.13/17; II.187/183,229,230; IX.97/98), and His injunctions (*kitāb,* IV.24/28; cf. 66/69). That is, it contains Allah's instructions for the Muslim community (IV.127/126) just as the Torah contained those for the Children of Israel and the Gospel those for the Christians. So Muḥammad is to give judgment according to it (V.48/52,49/54) as the Children of Israel were to be judged by the Taurah and the Christians by the Injīl. For this reason the Qur'ān is placed on a level with those two Scriptures (IX.111/112;cf.XXVIII.48,49; II.136/130),[59] and as the Gospel came to confirm the Torah so the Qur'ān has come to confirm them both (II.89/83; XII.111; X.37/38; XXXV.31/28).

It is thus clear that as Muḥammad claimed to be in the succession of the earlier Prophets as messengers called to summon men to the "way of God," so his Book, the Qur'ān is considered to be in the succession of the earlier Scriptures which men read to find what had been revealed from heaven as to that "way of God." It remains to see how both his conception of his own office and his conception of a Scripture connected with that office went beyond the teaching of the People of the Book.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

Columbia University, New York City

[59] Cf. in this connection such passages as II.4/3; III.84/78; IV.60/63,136/135, 162/160; V.59/64,66/70,68/72.

FREE WILL AND PREDESTINATION IN EARLY ISLAM* I

A Critique and Appreciation

"Free will inside a radius of determined environment creates," as L. Housman has observed, "an obscurity"; and when men confess a God who is omnipotent, and who creates and controls everything, since He alone possesses the power to give existence, that obscurity thickens into an almost impermeable darkness, which all but engulfs the light of human reason. But man's moral sense and his religious sentiment have time and again insisted upon the truth of both propositions, upon man's freedom and responsibility for his acts on the one hand, and upon God's omnipotence and creation of all action on the other; and time and again man has also searched to resolve the contradiction presented by the findings of his moral judgment and religious insight.

In Islam this contradiction appears reduced to its baldest, sharpest form, where Hegelians assume that the solution, if any, is to be found. But the orthodox theologians of Islam have brought to light no new answer to the riddle with all their argument, although they may have added some refinements to an old one. For in their thought, human freedom rests, as long before them the Stoic, Chrysippus, declared that it did, upon man's power to reject or accept the divine happening.[1] "In so far as a thing is adopted or rejected," says 'Abd al-Razzāq, an orthodox theologian of the fourteenth century A.D., "the act, which is decided upon, is free; but in so far as the totality of causes, named the complete cause, has acted, its production is determined."[2] Our intelligence testifies, asserts Ṣadr al-Sharī'a, that man has a free choice, but also that this free choice does not decide the existence, or non-existence of acts.[3]

But Muslim thinkers proposed other solutions to this problem before the ancient Semitic chance of time and the theologians finally fixed the stamp of orthodoxy upon this one; and Dr. Watt's book is dedicated to the study of the history of Muslim speculation on the questions of Predestination and Free-will during the first three centuries of Islam, when that speculation still moved free and untrammelled except by the fundamental assumptions formulated in the Qur'ān. On the basis of a very thorough analysis of his sources, which are described and judged in the Introduction, Dr. Watt discusses the various conceptions of man's condition advanced and

---

* **Free Will and Predestination in Early Islam.** By W. Montgomery Watt. London, Luzac and Company, Ltd., 1948. Pp. 181. 15s.

[1] Cf. A. Schmekel, *Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa,* pp. 117, 181, 244.

[2] Cf. *Journal Asiatique,* Ser. VII, tom I, p. 181. See Guyard's edition, pp. 57-58.

[3] Cf. A. de Vlieger's *Ketāb al-Qadar,* p. 181.

argued by the different sects, schools and individual thinkers of that period and has sought with undoubted success not only to present and interpret these conceptions in their local and temporary circumstances, but also to trace their historical development and to determine the reasons, which led ultimately to the orthodox position, by uncovering, wherever possible, the interplay of ideas between scholars, sects and schools.

Dr. Watt would perhaps disavow such an ambitious intent. But his synthetic treatment of the subject, which is virtually a new departure in the study of Muslim religious thought, opens out that prospect for the reader; and he has put forward well-considered views regarding the historical development of a department of that thought, wherever in his opinion his sources entitled him to do so. How valid his modestly tentative conclusions are will undoubtedly be the subject of much further inquiry and discussion; but many of them will assuredly stand the light of criticism and find ultimately general acceptance, even if some restatement, or modification, be required in the light of new material, or by the general recognition of some still disputed foreign influence.

Dr. Watt, for example, would regard the development of Muslim doctrine in this particular case as, on the whole, an "inside job," as does Professor L. Massignon with respect to Muslim religious thought generally in his *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane;* and against the contention of Becker and others that the Muslim doctrine of *Qadar* (Freewill) was due to Christian influence, he quotes with approval Wensinck's statement in regard to this doctrine that "in the main . . . the sequence of ideas is not of foreign origin, but is indigenous."[4]

But the thesis of foreign influence should not be altogether discounted, even if, as Dr. Watt maintains, the doctrine grows naturally out of one side of the teaching of the Qur'ān,[5] or, as Wensinck has declared, the sequence of ideas in it be indigenous, whatever that exactly means. For Quranic thought itself grew mostly out of and could easily and snugly fit into Massignon's Graeco-Aramaic culture of the countries of the Near East conquered and settled by the Muslims; and proof of the presence, or absence, of foreign influence in the further development of that thought would depend not so much upon the natural and logical nature of that development as upon the occasions and forces which stimulated it, the composition of the communities that promoted it, and also perhaps upon the statement of the problem.

The cradle of the Qadarite movement was Christian country,

[4] Watt, p. 58, note 27.
[5] Watt, p. 38, bottom.

Iraq and Syria. According to tradition the first to profess free will in Islam was a man of Baṣra, Ma'bad al-Juhanī;[6] and his immediate successor is said to have been a man of Damascus, Abū Marwān Jailan, crucified by the Caliph Hishām (724-743 A.H.) at the gate of his Capital.[7] Ma'bad is also reported, as Dr. Watt mentions,[8] to have had relations with a Christian of Iraq, by name Sūsan, who had become a Muslim, but later recanted; and the founder of a Khārijite sect, the Aṣḥāb Su'āl, who adhered to the doctrine of free-will, was a certain Shabīb [b. Yazīd al-Shaibānī] al-Najrānī, whose connection with Najrān, a Christian land prior to Islam, bears a similar purport.[9] The reports of Muslim historians also suggest that a great many Christians of the central provinces of the Caliphate confessed Islam quite early in its history, and that they were especially active in the ranks of rebel partisians and heretical sects, and in particular with the Khārijites;[10] and Syriac sources confirm the early conversion of Christians to Islam in bulk in Oman and Persistan.[11]

The fact, then, that John of Damascus wrote his works, as Dr. Watt points out in his rebuttal of Becker's thesis of Christian influence,[12] some twenty or thirty years after the debate on free-will began in Islam, is immaterial. John only gave philosophical expression to a belief held generally by the Christians of the Eastern Churches for centuries before his day; and there is a striking resemblance between the Khārijite, Qadarite and 'Adlite conception of *tafwīd*,[13] God's delegation to man of the power to act, whereby man becomes the equal of God in this respect at least and independent of divine control, and the Christian doctrine of free-will as defined by the Fathers of the Eastern Church, the Muslim *tafwīd* implying the Christian *autoexousios*.[14]

It was, indeed, this very belief in man's power to determine his

---

[6] Ibn Taghri Birdi, ed., Juynboll, vol. I, pp.221, 11 ff. and 222, 7 ff.

[7] Ṭabarī, *Annales,* ed., de Goeje, ii, 1777; al-Shahrastānī's *Kitāb al-milal wa'l-nihal,* ed., W. Cureton (hereafter cited as "C") i, p. 105.

[8] Watt, p. 53.

[9] Watt, p. 40. *Die Dogmatischen Lehren Der Anhaenger Des Islam* von . . . Al-Ash'arī (Bibliotheca Islamica 1 c) (hereafter cited as R) ed., H. Ritter, pp. 115.9-116.3.

[10] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 3434-3437; *Ibnal-Athiri Chronicon,* ed., Tornberg, III, pp. 313-314; *Kāmil of al-Mubarred,* ed., W. Wright, pp. 628-630, 680; *Origins of the Islamic State,* P. Kh. Hitti, I, p. 104; *Les Prairies d'or,* Mas'ūdi, ed., de Maynard et de Courteille, IV, p. 418; *Kitāb al-Ma'ārif,* Ibn Qutayba, p. 224; cf. also Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyreuth, vol. II (1907), p. 25.

[11] Cf. *Ishō'yahb Patriarchi III, Liber Epistularum,* Corpus Scriptorum Chr. Oriental, Scriptores Syri, ser. II, t. 64, pp. 248, 12; 251, 19-28; also pp. 179, 182, 187, 192-193.

[12] Watt, p. 58, note 27.

[13] Cf. Watt, pp. 33, 52-53, and 159.

[14] Cf. Watt, p. 58, note 27.

own acts and destiny that Orthodox Islam from the very beginning felt, and still feels, to be at once impious and incredible, and not, as Dr. Watt suggests,[15] the doctrine of the freedom of the human will itself, which ultimately the Orthodox were to accept and define as the power of choice. Al-Ash'arī, the founder of the greatest orthodox school, held that "It was God's custom to create [acts] in consequence of the created power (i.e., the power to act which God creates in man at the very moment of his creation of the act), or by virtue of it *(taḥtahu);* and the act, which takes place, is in conjunction with it, *once the creature has willed it and devoted himself to it;* and this act is named an "acquisition" *(kasb).* It is a creation on God's part, an origination and an initiation, and on man's part an "acquisition," a happening by virtue of his power.[16] A later theologian, al-Nasafī, declares in his creed that "Allah is the creator of all acts of His creatures . . . [but that] His creatures have actions of choice, for which they are rewarded or punished." And al-Nasafī's commentator, al-Taftāzānī, explains that "since it has been established by proof that the Creator is Allah, and that of necessity the power and will of the creature enter into some actions like the movement of grasping, but not into others like the movement of trembling, we needed to escape from this perplexing problem by saying that Allah is the creator of everything and the creature the "acquirer."[17]

Both movements, the voluntary as well as the involuntary, are created by God. As Muḥammad al-Barkawī puts it in his "Muslim Doctrine," "Man has a partial free choice and a will capable of seizing one of the two contraries, obedience or disobedience. But only one of these two contraries can be realized; for only one is created by God, and consequently only it can be acquired." He goes on: "To create is to produce what is not yet existent, and what does not yet exist as action that can be acquired, you may desire its creation, but you can never create it."[18]

But the creature has power, and al-Bāqillānī, who lived about a century after al-Ash'arī, explains the rôle of this power by saying that it "has an influence *(ta'thīr),* which is a special state *(ḥāla),*

---

[15] P. 55.

[16] C. I. p. 69, 6 ff.

[17] Cf. E. E. Elder, *A Commentary on the Creed of Islam,* New York, Columbia University Press, 1950, pp. 80 and 85; cf. al-Ash'arī's similar statement in C. p. 68.18—p. 69.1 "The creature is capable of *(qādir 'alā)* his acts. For a man finds in respect of himself a necessary distinction between movements of trembling in fear and convulsions and those of choice and will. And the distinction goes back to the fact that chosen movements happen by virtue of his power and depend upon the choice of one who is capable."

[18] As cited in A. de Vlieger's *Kitāb al-Qadar,* p. 181.

that is, some phase *(jiha)* or other of the act, which results from the connection of the created power to the act."[19] "And if," he says, "according to the principle of the Mu'tazilites the influence of the Power, or Divine Omnipotence, can be upon a state, namely, the coming-to-be *(ḥudūth)* and existence *(wujūd)*, or upon some mode *(wajh)* or other of action, why cannot the influence of the created power be upon a state, which is a quality of an existent thing, or upon some mode or other of action, such as, for example, a movement's coming to be in a special form. For movement and accident are, considered absolutely, different concepts, and so are rising and sitting; and the latter are two distinct states, for every rising is a movement, but not every movement is a rising."[20]

Thus the human will and power lend to an act created by God certain directions, or qualities, by virtue of which man assumes the act as his own; and in especial they impart to it the quality of being known, of intention, which gives it validity in the legal and religious spheres. And an act thus qualified conforms at least to one of Aristotle's conditions for a free act. It is without ignorance. It cannot even be said that it is done under compulsion.

The evolution of Muslim thought on the problem of man's freedom can be better understood, once it is observed that that thought shifted from the moral to the metaphysical realm without due recognition of that fact. In the beginning, with the Qadarites, the Khārijites, and even with the Mu'tazilites, man's freedom like God's justice was a postulate of the moral sense. Al-Shahrastānī reports that one of the earliest of the Mu'tazilites, Wāṣil b.'Aṭā', declared that "The Creator Most High is wise and just, so that it is impossible to attribute to Him evil, or wrong, or that He will for His creatures the opposite of what He commands, and judge and punish them for that. The creature is the doer of good and evil, belief and unbelief, disobedience or obedience, and is requited for his action. The Lord Most High has enabled him *(aqdara 'alā)* for all that."[21]

As Dr. Watt has so justly observed in his chapter entitled "The Beginning of the Doctrine of Qadar,"[22] "The principle underlying all these [early] views [of man's freedom] is that of 'not fixing evil upon God,' " the source of which is not God, but the creature. But along with the ascription of evil to God the moral sense also rejects the attribution of responsibility for necessitated acts and

[19] C. I. p. 70, 4-6.

[20] C. I. p. 69.15-70.1. "Coming-to-be" and "existence," it should be observed, are accidents.

[21] C. I. p. 32.7.

[22] Watt, P. 53; cf. pp. 33, 35, 41, 48 and especially 165.

demands the delegation to man of the power to act freely upon choice.[23]

The Muslim argument so far moves in a round of conceptions, which were the stock-in-trade of Christian apologists in early Islamic times,[24] and which were fundamental to Eastern Christian thought concerning the relations of God and man long before Muḥammad stepped forth to prophesy; and if this argument had prevailed in Islam, if even it had influenced the debate on freedom cogently, the Muslim doctrines of God and man would have grown out of a moral as well as a metaphysical consideration of things. But an overpowering sense of God's uniqueness and omnipotence, as conveyed, for example, in the words of Sura CXII: "Say: The fact is, Allah is One. Allah, *al-Ṣamad* (the Eternal), did not beget and was not begotten, and there is none like unto Him," and in the declaration of al-Ash'arī that "He (God) is the king of His creation, doing what He wishes and judging as He pleases; if He were to bring all the creatures into heaven, it would not be unrighteousness, and if He were to cast them all into Hell, it would not be tyranny; for injustice is the disposal of what the disposer does not possess, or the putting of a thing where it does not belong, but He is the absolute possessor,"[25] —and an ever clearer realization of the metaphysical implications of these dogmas in the light of Greek philosophical speculations[26] turned Muslim theologians away from an ethical contemplation of God and man and concentrated their thought on a metaphysical analysis and explanation of their natures and being.

Indubitably God is still just and good in the eyes of the orthodox theologians of Islam, but His goodness is no longer a postulate of man's moral sense, which cannot, indeed, apprehend that goodness, far less judge it. By virtue of His omnipotence God is the author of both the good and the evil, which man finds in this world. But God's will, as it comes to light in His creation, is the good, reason and moral sense to the contrary notwithstanding; and the evil which God creates, and man acquires by his choice of it, is evil only in man's sight and in relation to man, but not in God's sight or in relation to Him.[27]

Man also is still responsible for his acts, even if he does not produce them; and he is therefore in some sense free, since in no

---

[23] Cf. Watt, pp. 33, 39 and especially 52.

[24] See Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, XCIV, 1590 ff.; XCVI, 1335 ff.; 1530 ff. and 1587 ff.

[25] C. I. p. 73.13 ff.; cf. also C. I. 71.14; 71.17; 72.1.

[26] Cf. C. I. pp. 18, .2-3; 31, .16 ff.; 37.5 and last line; 42.6, 44.17; 46.3 ff. 47.4, 8; 48.1; 52.4; 53.7.

[27] Cf. Watt, pp. 144, 167 bottom.

other wise can his responsibility be justified. But his freedom is not now "the natural liberty and power of acting upon choice" demanded by the moral sense. Only God has that natural liberty and power; and man's freedom is restricted to the power of choice. "Acquisition" (man's acquirement of his acts), say the Ḥanifites, "is just the firm decision. Once we have decided firmly to do a thing, God creates the result of this firm resolution, i.e., the act upon which we have resolved."[28] And by this resolution, as 'Abd al-Razzāq explains, an act, which was only possible before, is produced necessarily. The act according to 'Abd al-Razzāq is both free and fatal, free since man freely chooses it, but also fatal, since once man's choice has been made, all the other causes of the act, and even the power by which man acquires it as his own, are brought into existence by God.[29]

With the shift from a moral to a metaphysical consideration of God and man in the ninth century the problem of human freedom in Islam no longer centered, as previously to that century, in the simple, moral issue of the origin of evil, but in the complex question of origination in general. Human freedom was no longer asserted in justification of God's goodness, or as a corollary of man's responsibility, or as a partial explanation of the evil in this world, but was considered and defined in terms of the power of origination. As Dr. Watt has aptly remarked: "The question was whether man had the power, or not, to determine his own actions,"[30] which raised the further question of what was the nature of that power, granted man had it. And origination, or creation, was defined in two ways, either to act without instrument or member, or, with Aristotle, to act as determined upon,[31] that is, with knowledge and without compulsion.[32]

The definition of man's freedom in terms of power thus became one of the crucial questions in Islam from the ninth century onward; and, as Dr. Watt has pointed out, "it led to difficulties of its own."[33] Creation defined as action without instrument, or member, was recognized by all parties as a divine prerogative. But the Mu'tazilites generally maintained that man had the power to create

---

[28] Cited from A. de Vlieger's *Kitāb al-Qadar*, p. 180.

[29] Cf. 'Abd ar-Razzāq, *"Traité de la Prédestination et du libre Arbitre," Journal Asiatique*, Ser. VII, tom. 1 (1873) pp. 153 ff.; which view has its forerunners in certain Mu'tazilite speculations, cf. those of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Ḥakim, Watt, pp. 116-117; cf. Thumama, C. I. p. 505 ff.

[30] See Watt, p. 55; cf. p. 168.

[31] R. p. 228, 9-11; cf. p. 195, 4-9. See also C. I. p. 528-9; 533.18.20.

[32] Cf. R. p. 195.6. See Watt, p. 116. Hishām b. 'Abd al-Ḥakim's *Takhliyat al-Shu'un* gives "without compulsion."

[33] P. 69.

his own acts in the sense that he could produce some of them as determined upon.[34]

The actual basis for this assertion on their part was the demand of the moral sense for justice and reasonableness in God's conduct towards man. "The power over injustice is not predicated of the Doer of Justice," declares al-Naẓẓām, "God has only the power to do that of which He knows that it has good in it for His creatures";[35] and al-Jubbā'ī and his son, Abū Hāshim, went so far as to affirm that "God does not reserve from His creatures any good, advantage, or favour, of which He knows that, if He does it, they will be obedient and repentant,"[36] which looks like prevenient grace. "It is absurd," proclaimed Wāṣil b. 'Aṭa', "that the creature be exhorted to act when it is impossible for him to act."[37] Compare with these statements the orthodox, Ash'arite doctrine, that the imposing as a duty of that, of which man is not capable, is possible,[38] and al-Ash'arī's own declaration that "If he (the Muslim in hell) repent, I do not maintain that God must accept his repentace according to the judgment of reason. For He (God) it is who makes necessary, and nothing is necessary for Him. But revelation has announced the acceptance of the repentant and the cry of the distressed."[39]

The very framing of the questions raised and debated in Mu'tazilite circles shows, however, that the overwhelming sentiment, that established omnipotence as the essential attribute of God, the Creator, and the general recognition of that doctrine, forced the Mu'tazilites to consider freedom as a function of power and not as an ethical demand, a corollary of justice, and to argue the problem of human liberty on that basis alone. "Is capacity (*istitā'a*) a power (*qudra*) to act in the moment of the act?" "Is there attributed to man the power to do the one of two opposites, which he has not done, when the other has come to be?" "Is a man able in the first [moment] to act in it, or does he act in the second?" "Does the act take place by means of the capacity?" Is the power of speech the same as the power of walking?" "Is a man capable of that which occurs to his mind, or not?" "Can the capable be impotent?" "Has God the power to create the accidents?" "Has he power over that, over which He has given His creatures power?" "Can He do that which He knows will not be?"[40]

---

[34] Cf. R. p. 228.10 ff. and with it compare p. 195.7 ff.

[35] C. I. p. 37, 11-13; cf. pp. 48.12; 58.4; 74.1; cf. also p. 53.1 (al-Jāḥiz); p. 55.8 (al-Jubbā'ī and Abū Ḥāshim), and R. p. 200.7, 12; p. 202.15.

[36] C. I. p. 55.12.

[37] C. I. p. 32.11-13.

[38] C. I. p. 68.14.

[39] C. I. p. 72.1.

[40] R. pp. 231.3, 7; 233.7; 235.8,12; 237.8; 239.3; 240.1; 198.14; 199.3 (cf. 199.10); 203.5.

Four main schools of thought developed in Islam on the question of man's freedom, the various stands of which al-Shahrastānī has conveniently summarized in his section on the Jabarites, the Islamic Necessitarians.[41] *"Jabar,"* he writes, "is the denial of action in reality on the part of the creature and its attribution to the Lord Most High. But there are several kinds of Jabarites. The pure Jabarites are those who do not recognize any act or any power to act on the part of the creature.[42] The moderate Jabarites recognize a power on the part of the creature, which power, however, has no influence [on the act] at all.[43] Those who recognize an influence of the created power upon the act and name it "acquisition" are not Jabarites."[44]

"The Mu'tazilites," he goes on, "name those Jabarites, who do not recognize for the created power an unconditioned influence upon the origination and bringing to existence [of acts], which compelled them to style as Jabarites those of their associates who maintained that 'generated' (or mediated) acts have no agents, since they did not recognize for the created power any influence upon these [acts].[45] The Najjārites and Ḍirārites have been accounted as Jabarites by those who have written about their doctrines, and the majority of the Kilābites as Sifātites (who upheld the predication of attributes to God). The Ash'arites have been named sometimes Ḥashwites (Anthropomorphists) and sometimes Jabarites." Al-Shahrastānī accepts the inclusion of the Najjārites and Ḍirārites among the Jabarites, but not that of the Ash'arites, whom he assigns to the Ṣifātites.

The majority of the Mu'tazilites, then, maintained that man is the creator of his acts, when these acts happen as determined upon by him.[46] The Jabarites denied that man acts at all or has the power to act. The acts of man, says Jahm b. Ṣafwān, are in no wise different from those of inanimate things, from a tree's bringing forth fruit, for example.[47] And between these two positions stood those who affirmed that man has a power to act which either does, or does not, influence the act in some fashion.

Orthodox Islam rejected both the determinism of the Jabarites and the self-determination of the Mu'tazilites. It also repudiated finally the idea of a power which has no influence at all upon man's

---

[41] C. I. p. 59.15-60.5.

[42] C. I. 59.15-60.5.

[43] Cf. The positions of some Mu'tazilites, Mu'ammar, Thumāma, al-Jāḥiẓ on mediated acts as described later; cf. also that of al-Najjār C. I. 62.5.

[44] Cf. C. I. 69.9-70.12 (Bāqilānī); 63.11 (Dirār); Watt. 106-109.

[45] C. I. 38.15 (al-Ka'bī on al-Naẓẓām); 49.14 (Thumāma, cf. 47.11; 50.5); 52.7 (al-Jāḥiẓ); 47.1 (Al-Sulamī).

[46] C. I. 50.13 (al-Fuwatī); 55.1-4 (al-Jubbā'ī and Abū Hāshim); R. 228,5,10.

[47] C. I. 60, last line-61, 2.

acts. Al-Shahrastānī cites al-Ash'arī as affirming a power of the creature over his acts;[48] and about a century later al-Bāqillānī described the function of the creaturely power as follows:[49] "The proof stands that the created power is not qualified to create. But the qualities of an act, or its modes, or relations, are not confined to the aspect of its coming-to-be. There are, on the contrary, other modes besides the coming-to-be, such as a substance's being a substance occupying space, or receptive of an accident, or an accident's being an accident and black, or white, etc., which would be states *(aḥwāl)* with those who affirm states." He continues: "The aspect of an act's coming-to-be as the result of a created power, or by virtue of it, is a special relation named "acquisition," which is the influence of the created power [upon the act]." "And this influence of the created power is," he says, "a special state, which is some aspect or other of the act, which results from the connection of the created power with the act," that movement, for example, which God alone can create, should be right, or left, or rising, or sitting down, in consequence of the connection of the created power. The quality, or mode, is also, indeed, appointed by God.[50] But man's choice is free; and God's custom is to create the act with the quality, or mode, which man has chosen and determined upon; and thus man "acquires" the act as his own by the power to act which God creates in him at the moment of the act.

(To be concluded in October issue)

WILLIAM THOMSON

Harvard University

---

[48] C. I. 68.18.
[49] C. I. 69.9 ff.; 69.13 ff.; and 70.4 ff.
[50] C. I. 70.6.

Histoire du Maroc. By Henri Terasse. Casablanca, Editions Atlantides, 1949. Vol. I. pp. 401.

Here, at last, is what we who love Morocco have been long awaiting, the definitive history of our favorite non-native land written by the one man capable of doing it justice. On the soil of North Africa, the late war kept many of us busy making and witnessing history. Henri Terrasse, however, in the midst of the conflict also found the time and the objectivity to write it. Here then is one of the few positive benefits derived from that epoch. It carries us through the period of the Almohades, through the thirteenth century. Let us hope that the second volume will follow without the need of another war.

When a book is as good as this one, there is little that a reviewer can say except to praise it, and to state its contents. Henri Terrasse has consulted all available documentary sources, and used them critically. His solution of the problem of the foundation of Fez by the Idrises, father and son, will serve as an excellent example. He is no dry historian, content to record the birth and death of kings and the rape of towns; he takes geographical, economic, and cultural factors into consideration. So well rounded a work of history is this that it can serve as a model for historians in general. Perhaps he has had the advantage over most of our present-day historians in being familiar in the original with the works of such men as el Bekri and the great Ibn Khaldun, whose *Prolegomena* inspired Toynbee.

As a prehistorian and anthropologist there are only two things which this reviewer can think of that might have been added: one is the evidence of the American archaeological work at the Caves of Hercules before and after the war. Since this is still unpublished Professor Terrasse had no means of knowing about it. It shows that the Berbers of that region were in the Neolithic stage of culture until and into the Roman period. This discovery has far-reaching implications. The second is that the Guanches of the Canary Islands were in the Neolithic at the time of the Spanish conquest. Existing accounts of their way of life give us by analogy an excellent clue to the general cultural status of the non-punicized Berbers at the time of the Roman arrival. It is gratifying to find that Henri Terrasse had come more or less to the same conclusions without this evidence.

The book is divided into five parts: (1) Introduction, Land and People; (2) Part One, Morocco in Antiquity; (3) Part Two, Morocco and the Muslim Conquest; (4) Part Three, Morocco and the Muslim Problem; and (5) Part Four, Morocco at the Head of the Muslim West: the Apogee of Berber Islam.

The introduction includes a masterful summary of the geography of Morocco and of its position in the Mediterranean world. He divides it into three natural realms, the mountains, the fertile inland and Atlantic-bordered plain, and the outer Morocco with its steppes, desert, and chains of oases. The mountains have always formed a zone of revolt (bled es-siba'), the plains the seat of govern-

ment (bled el makhzen), while the outer desert serves as breeding ground of political and religious movements, producing invasions of the populous and fertile regions to the north and west, and of Spain. Following the geographical chapter is a summary of information on the Berbers, their language, way of life, and divisions into tribes and confederations.

Book One carries us through the Punic and Roman periods, with an estimate of Roman civilization in Morocco, derived from the archaeological evidence as well as from documents. Book Two contains two chapters, one on the early Arab raids and attempts at conversion of the Berbers to orthodox Islam, and the other on the role of the Khawarij in the same effort. In the first chapter he rejects the theory of Gautier that the Arab conquest was made easy by the preceding destruction of the power of the sedentary, Branes-derived Berbers by the nomadic, Botr element. Terasse exposes the fallacy of lumping all Berbers into these two categories and considers the identification of Kahena and her people with Botr nomads to be unwarranted.

Book Three covers the foundation of the Idrisite dynasty in Fez, its territorial extensions, and the rise of its branches in the Ghomara country and at Nekor; he then describes the Fatemid and Omeyyad intrusions, with a section on the Omeyyad dynasty in Spain and on the role of the Zenata. In a summary chapter he describes life in Morocco in the 10th and 11th centuries on the basis of surviving documents. He shows the distribution of Berber tribes at that time, and notes that Arab-speakers were confined to the region of Fez, the northern cities, and the Jebala. Sijilmassa (Tafilelt) was a great caravan center in which merchants from Baghdad, Kufa, and Damascus had established themselves in oases populated by Senhaja. Morocco was a conglomerate of small Berber republics of diverse religions; along with orthodox Islam were islands of Khawarij and Shia; the Idrisites themselves followed the mutazilite doctrine. In the Grand Atlas, some tribes still worshipped a ram. Two prophets had written pseudo-Korans in Berber. However, owing to influences from Cordova the Malekite rite was on the ascent. The *bled el makẖzen* was well-wooded, with both forests and orchards; the villages large and prosperous, the land peaceful and travel safe. These reviews of Moroccan civilization at different periods, of which this is a notable example, make Terrasse's work of special interest to anthropologists and alive for all readers.

Book Four is divided into two sections (A) the Almoravids, and (B) the Almohades. Almoravid is a corruption of *al-murābitūn,* the people who live in a *ribāṭ,* which is a refuge or monastery. A Senhajan Berber from the Sahara, Yahya ibn Yasin, made the pilgrimage. Coming home, he preached a tightening of morals to the Tuareg, who rejected his exhortations. Fleeing to an island, either in the Niger river or the Atlantic off Rio del Oro, he established a *ribāṭ,* where other zealots joined him. From this base of operations the Almoravids erected a state in Mauretania, and invaded first Sijilmassa, then the rest of Morocco, where they founded Marrakesh, and finally Spain. These men were veiled Senhaja. They formed a military aristocracy under their first sultan, Yusuf ibn Tashfin, who, from his capital in Marrakesh, united Morocco for the first time in

history. Their religion was nothing more than strict Maliki Islam, in spreading which they wiped out the earlier deviations and heresies.

Almohades means *al-muwaḥḥidūn,* the Unitarians. Another reformer from the south, Mohammed ibn Tumert, a Masmuda Berber from the Anti-Atlas, studied in Bagdad and Cairo. Becoming violently anti-Malikite, he developed a doctrine of divine unity *(tawḥīd)* and rejected *qiyās* and *ijmā'* as means of determining law. Coming back to North Africa he preached reforms, being particularly severe agains wine drinking and the wearing of rich clothing. He was shocked to find that among the Almoravids the men wore veils while the women went about bare-faced. Preaching in Marrakesh, he was sent outside the city; he retreated to the Glawa country and started a rebellion. He created a capital at Tinmel, near his birthplace, called himself a *mahdi,* wrote a holy book of his own in Berber, collected a company of fellow-fleers, and built up a governing council of ten disciples and forty tribal delegates. His government was thus one of the Masmuda Berbers of the Atlas and beyond. With them he invaded the prized lands to the north, and died in 1130, one year later. Abd el Mumen, a Zenata Berber, succeeded him, and his own tribe was added to the elite. Setting himself up as caliph, Abd el Mumen further conquered Spain. Following the Almoravid example, the conquering tribesmen became a military and governmental class. These two dynasties did much to convert Morocco into its present form; the type of government which still survives was established and the religion of the country unified. The Beni Hillal Bedawin entered Morocco in this period, and completed the work of deforestation begun by the veiled Senhaja. Sufi doctors came from Spain and from the east, and the religious brotherhoods so typical of modern Moroccan society arose. Under Abd el Mumen's heavy taxation Andalusian architects built many of the impressive buildings of Morocco, such as the Kutubiya in Marrakesh, which visitors see today. For further details, read the original.

CARLETON S. COON

University Museum,
University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Indonesia Report. The collected dispatches of the American Correspondents who died in Bombay, India, July 12, 1949, on their return from a tour of Indonesia. Foreword by William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star. Tucson, Arizona, The Arizona Daily Star, 1949.

When the news of the airplane crash near Bombay, India on the 12th of July, 1949, reached the United States, it was more than the news of another airplane accident. For onboard the plane were fourteen of a party of sixteen American news and radio reporters returning from a study-tour of Indonesia. Their information and opinions, based on personal interviews and careful observation, might—if known—have had far reaching influence. But they were never to be told.

It was but natural, therefore, that one of the two survivors from

the expedition, that is William R. Mathews, would take on himself the task to collect the dispatches and comments these reporters sent home while still on their trip. The *Indonesia Report* is the result of his work. Mr. Mathews himself wrote a foreword, giving the background and the story of the tour, and also a short biographical note on each of the 14 reporters who died in the accident.

A chronology of events in Indonesia from 1940 to 1949 concludes the collection.

To complete the story of the expedition, Mr. Mathews published an extra edition of his own paper, on October 3, 1949, in which he collected all of his own dispatches from the tour, and articles written on his return home.

Together these two collections contain factual material and personal interpretations of the development in Indonesia which are of extreme value to those interested in this part of the world, and in the problems surrounding the birth of the new Indonesian Republic. The reports represent a variety of opinions, clearly stated, and are accompanied by a series of informative pictures.

KJELL KNUTSEN

Hartford, Connecticut

History of Palestine from 135 A. D. to Modern Times. By James Parkes. London, Gollancz, 1949. 21s. Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1949. pp. 391, map. $5.00.

Dr. Parkes with his gift of readable writing has added another to the (computed) library of 14,000 books, articles, pamphlets and papers that have appeared on various aspects of Palestine during the past ninety years. His own bibliographies are proof enough—though not even he has read every thing! Dr. Parkes has given his best to the central problem of the first half of the twentieth century. He writes in an undaunted vein, with his eye on the future even in the earlier chapters; for though he starts well before 135 A.D., the larger part of the volume is (naturally) devoted to the events of the harrowing days of the mandate. It has often been difficult to write impartially over the little land where there have been tensions of various kinds for millennia, but Dr. Parkes has intended fairness even in matters where others would disagree because the feeling will come that, granted the desire to absorb and interpret, he does not have all the facts. More than once we have put down this "untedious" volume indulging in a series of "If onlies"! If only the author had known the country and its peoples through long residence rather than prolonged reading! . . . If only he had been familiar with the languages and thought forms of the peoples! . . . Hence if only he had talked with some of the folk criticized, without being (too) satisfied with a possibly biased or second-hand account of men and things! . . .

Is not, for instance, the significance and influence of the Grand Mufti somewhat overdone? In speaking about "Anglicans and British Missionaries" (page 336), why does he take it for granted that "pro Arab" views were *due* to being linked with "Native Arab

Christian Churches"? In a connection of this kind "pro-Arab" would seem wrongly synonymous with "anti-Jew"; while, moral issues apart, the missionary community in Palestine and the lands around is perhaps more *international* than in most parts of the world. Or how comes it that in the discussion of the "mandate years" there is no reference to the name of "Magnes" either in connection with the University or the suggested bi-national state? None the less, some of Dr. Parkes' closing words reflect the message of the chancellor over two decades:—"There will be no peace in Palestine until there is reconciliation between Jewish and Arab *needs*." (Italics ours.) Needs are not claims. It is here that the majority of Palestine well-wishers are united.

We are not sure that Dr. Parkes has proved that vis à vis Islam, save in an abstractly theoretical way, "no particular sanctity of any kind has ever been attributed to Palestine as a whole" (p. 201). His own repeated admission as to the "ex-Christian and ex-Jewish" ancestry of very many non-city Muslims would seem to refute the other contention. Or the remark (p. 83) that "those who find it a subject of congratulation that among the Arab peasants are to be found unchanged—(may we interpolate "despite the vicissitudes of centuries"?)—the economy and costume of the Bible, ignore the *fact that this is only possible* (italics ours) because of the regression which has resulted from centuries of "Muslim Rule" should surely be balanced by the appreciation of Robinson and Thomson (p. 233) for the former's identification of Biblical sites by "names still preserved by the fellaheen"—and for the latter's application of the "customs and folklore of the existing fellaheen to hitherto unexplained or wrongly explained Biblical narratives." You can't have it both ways. And it is surely worth remembering in an environment where conservatism and tradition die hard that some of the "city" Arab families claim that their ancestors were settled by 'Umar the Great. We should remember too that "Arab" is both an "ethnic" and a "linguistic" as well as a "geographical" term.

There are other details (apart from misprints) where readers would take issue with the author. The present reviewer has noted nearly two dozen "mistakes" of one kind or another. But we must not obscure the main issues. The book was apparently more hurriedly composed than other works of Dr. Parkes, but this was probably unavoidable in the attempt to fulfill the aim of setting "this modern problem in its historical perspective." As with so much in Palestine the "authority" must be able to discern the places where history passes into legend, and to verify the verifiable by recourse, maybe, say to the Mission Boards in London or New York, with their experiences of a century and more—a source of information based mostly on the experience of life with ordinary people that has hardly been tapped, whether by the statesmen at the beginning of this century or by the many who have essayed the task of explaining at least part of the "Palestine Problem" to a public that "forgets so soon." *If only,* however, there might be an examination of the shared responsibility "for the misery which has befallen the country" on the part of those on whom Dr. Parkes' strictures fall, including "the Christian Churches" (why plural?), there might yet be the

dawn of a better day. It is not only a question of "what happened in Palestine" or "how it happened," but "why it happened"—because only then can we all be in a position to say that it won't happen again.

ERIC F. F. BISHOP

Glasgow University,
Glasgow, Scotland

Palestine—Mohammedan Holy Land. By Charles D. Matthews, Ph.D. With a Foreword by Julian Obermann. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1949. pp. xxx, 176.

This volume, which opens so nicely and remains open and brings back memories of pre-war paper in Britain, is rightly and "respectfully dedicated "to *Charles Cutler Torrey,* teacher of many (and beloved) Over the widest of Semitic Fields." The present book is by one of his pupils, who was also enabled to spend time in Jerusalem both in the American School of Oriental Research and the Newman School of Missions.

Was it designedly that the Editor of THE MUSLIM WORLD sent this book for review soon after that of Dr. James Parkes' on *A History of Palestine?* There are statements in the two volumes which would seem mutually contradictory. Thus Dr. Parkes:—"For Muslims the issue is not Palestine as a Holy Land, but Jerusalem as a Holy City." "In a very special sense," says Dr. Obermann, "the present volume does bear on the intricacies of present-day Palestine . . ." (The whole Foreword needs reading with its reference to the "interdependence of Judaism, Christianity and Islam.") The author himself sets out on his introductory essay with the words:—"Palestine, with Jerusalem, the Holy City is universally regarded by the Mohammedan world as a sacred land."

Actually it is two cities that are concerned in the present volume, Jerusalem and Hebron; which have been the resort of pilgrims for centuries—in this case Muslim Pilgrims.

Two "treatises" are included of unequal length. The first is *The Book of Arousing Souls to visit Jerusalem's Holy Walls* by a Damascene scholar of Umayyad times, *Ibn al Firkah,* whose concluding chapter on the "merits of the Tomb of Abraham" forms a good introduction to the second "treatise" which deals almost exclusively with Hebron and Abraham, the Friend of God. This is the work of a native of Hebron, *Abu 'l Fida,* who has made as much of his connection with this Holy City as Malik ibn Anas did with his Madina origin. *Abu 'l Fida's* work is to be dated a century later than *Ibn al Firkah.*

Dr. Matthews has collected over 100 notes and references for each of the "treatises," which with the glossary are not the least useful part of the book; but there is surely a lapse of Biblical history on page 147, where "Jacob" should read "Joseph" and "Rebecca" should be "Rachel." We have ourselves been guilty of similar forgetfulnesses. The treatises are traditions and cover somewhat familiar ground, but it is good to have the opportunity of consulting references comfortably. Many of the traditions are familiar to the "dwellers in Jerusalem," to say nothing of Hebron, and some of

them would seem to have grown in scope since the times of the two Muslim savants. The equation in Palestine of the personalities of Elijah (Mar Elias) St. George and *al Khidr* (Greenmantle) is confirmed. Jerusalem was considered to be in Syria, as it still is in the Sudan, where boundary lines count for little. Most readers will probably find the former treatise considerably less tedious than *The Book of Inciting Desire*—perhaps because there is the impression of more propaganda in *Abu 'l Fida*. All the same he is quite as good as most "guide books" of the modern type. How true, too, to get a reference to the snow (page 108), which reminds us that Hebron is higher than Jerusalem. Gabriel, too, seems to have meant as much to Abraham as to Muḥammad—according to tradition the Patriarch was the first to do a number of things.

Perhaps one of the points useful for understanding the attitude of less sophisticated Palestinian Muslims today towards the land of their birth is the intertwining of its history with that of Arabia through tradition (a factor to which Dr. Parkes also refers). Rightly or wrongly Ishmael counts for a very great deal, while Abraham remains the "Friend of God" alike for Muslim, Jew and Christian. We are grateful for finding this "feeling" so well portrayed; while remembering that for very much of what passed into Islamic tradition the New Testament references to Abraham must have formed a bridge.

We do not consider, however, that Dr. Matthews is as *au fait* as he might be with New Testament scholarship. His two quotations (Lk. 10.18. and i Pet 3,19) utilized as parallels to the so-called "blunders of Mohammed" are not very happy nor to the point. There is a place where the study of Islam as it is may throw light on the two monotheistic religions that preceded it; but we question whether, even if in the relationship of the Islamic system and the Christian there is similarity in the use put to the Gospels and the *aḥādīth*, there is sufficient similarity in purpose and manner (let alone matter) to warrant the assumption that they serve a similar "intention" or were subject to the same critical investigation.

Yet when all is said and done we are appreciative of the (incidental) fact that "it was natural that Islam, as a Biblical religion should take over the holy places in the Biblical Land and make them its own shrine," but it means (more important) that the "continuing population" has to find the place of agreement sooner or later. Will this be in their united appraisal of Abraham as the "Friend of God"? If so, what next?

ERIC F. F. BISHOP

Teach Yourself Arabic. By A. S. Tritton, D. Litt. Hodder & Stoughton, for the English Universities Press Ltd., London. 1943; reprinted 1944. 3/6. David MacKay Co., Philadelphia, for the English Universities Press Ltd. $1.50. pp. 294.

The recent, and continuing, development of innovations in language teaching methods has been both rapid and radical; and has tended to divide teachers into two conflicting, or anyway distinct camps. In the Islamic languages, relatively little material has as yet been made available in the novel manner. Converts to the new techniques, among whom this reviewer must be counted, are on the

lookout, therefore, for new presentations implementing contemporary linguistic theory. For them, what delight there would be in seeing Arabic, Persian, Urdū, or Turkish counterparts to, for instance, the Heath-Chicago series of Graded Readers in French, German, Italian, or to such a teaching source as Sharp & Strothmann's *German Reading Grammar*—to give illustrations that come at random to mind. Elder's *Arabic Grammar* (unforunately badly printed) was a beginning in the inductive style; and Kapliwatsky's recent 4-volume work from Jerusalem is an interesting instance of the new approach.

Tritton's Arabic primer now before us, on the other hand, is a new contribution essentially in the deductive tradition. The book comprises 36 fairly short lessons, each consisting of grammar, vocabulary, and exercises. The grammar comes in two or three pages of rules and illustrations (occasionally illustrations and rules); each vocabulary lists 25 to 30 new words with their English equivalents; and the two exercises are made up of about ten disconnected sentences of Arabic and English, respectively, for translation. At the end are extensive and convenient verb tables; and a key to all the exercises. There is a short index, but no general vocabulary.

That the manual is the work of Prof. Tritton guarantees the reliability of its Arabic. Further to judge the book by standards appropriate to its intent and to the tradition within which it appears, the immediate procedure would seem to be a comparison with Thatcher. Tritton is, first of all, shorter—and very considerably less expensive (about one-quarter the price). To be precise, it compares with Thatcher's Part I. Thatcher adds the systematic grammar of his Part II, the passages for reading of his Supplement, and his two comprehensive vocabularies for these sections. Another difference lies in Tritton's colloquial style, which makes the grammar sections more engaging and in some cases simpler to grasp. He is always less complicated in exposition, though at times succint to the point of obscurity. As to vocabulary, neither seems felicitous: Thatcher introduces a word for 'goose' in his second lesson, while Tritton in Lesson 5 brings in 'elbow' and 'finger-nail'—these and similar words, surely, a beginner might wait for some years before meeting again in his reading. (Admittedly the phrase *marāfiq al-ḥāyah* does occur, with a frequency of 6, in Brill's press list; but for that particular meaning an acquaintance with the root would seem just as adequate preparation.)

A valuable aspect of Tritton's work is the scientific phonetic description of the sounds of Arabic, in the Introduction, and the use of the phonetic alphabet for transcription. (There are some interesting deviations from Gairdner here.) On the other hand, the beginner would certainly miss the transliteration of new words in the vocabularies (which Thatcher continues for the first 18 lessons). An advantage which the British edition has (the American reprint is by photographic process, on poorer paper, and hardly conserves this) is that the large Arabic type is eminently clear.

A further criterion is inner consistency and arrangement. Here Tritton fares only tolerably well. For instance, he indicates (p. 66) that the plural of *māl* is on the measure *af'āl,* but apparently leaves it to the student's ingenuity to construct *amwāl* from this (cf. *thiyāb*

from *thawb*, p. 61). Again, this reviewer counted in the first fifteen exercises an average of almost two words per lesson in the sentences posed for translation, which are words that do not, in fact, occur in the vocabularies or lessons up to that point. Examples: in Exercise 5, the words *qabīlah* (listed in Vocabulary 9), *qabl, wa* (explained p. 40), *ʿalā*. To eradicate this type of oversight is admittedly a meticulous task, but for a "teach yourself" venture surely not a thankless one.

However, these slips are remediable for the student working with an instructor; and the question seems in the end to remain this: should a teacher of Arabic, using deductive grammar methods, initiate his pupils with this Tritton manual, or should he choose Thatcher. That Tritton himself is open-minded on this issue is perhaps indicated by the fact that a new edition of Thatcher is announced in London, "revised and corrected" by Tritton himself. The present reviewer, however, has not yet seen this new edition.

WILFRED CANTWELL SMITH

McGill University, Montreal

Spoken Turkish. By Norman A. McQuown and Sadi Koylan. Copyright 1944 by Linguistic Society of America. New York, Henry Holt and Co. 2 Vols. pp. 999.

Probably the most complete and thorough textbook for the study of the Turkish Language issued to date is that prepared under the Linguistic Society of America originally for the use of the Armed Forces during World War II, and now published under the title "Spoken Turkish."

The two-volume textbook is designed to be useful at the very lowest level of language learning, that is to say the individual student working alone. For this reason, the first twelve lessons are to be accompanied by twenty-four double-faced recordings of the Turkish material contained in them. The lessons are equally valuable for group instruction, and even if a Turkish-speaking teacher is available the recordings would still be valuable for practice use between classes.

The primary purpose of these lessons is to teach the spoken, colloquial language of modern Turkey. But the reading of Turkish is also to be taken up along with the lessons, and they should prove a sound foundation for even the most literary study that might be desired later.

The course consists of thirty units or lessons, to cover approximately two hundred hours of language study. The thirty units are divided into five major sections, each containing five teaching units and one review. Each unit contains basic sentences, word study or grammatical construction, a "listening in" section of conversations or of stories, and practice conversation, as well as a list of the new words used. At the back of Volume Two are two complete vocabularies, Turkish-English and English-Turkish, containing all words used in the manual.

These lessons are based on the inductive, or conversational, method of instruction. The Turkish speaker (or recording) serves as model to be copied in pronunciation and phrasing. The text pro-

vides the necessary explanation. The "word study" sections gradually build up the structure of the language, with its various verb forms and endings, and include skilful treatment of the participles and gerunds.

The whole work has been prepared very painstakingly, and should provide the earnest student with a good working knowledge of the language in much shorter time than was formerly necessary.

EDWARD T. PERRY

Hartford, Conn.

Spoken Malay. By Professor Isidore Dyen (Yale University) with the collaboration of Amat bin Haji Amir, Amat bin Awal, and Max Seitelman. New York, Henry Holt and Company. Identical with the edition prepared for the United States Armed Forces Institute during the last war. pp. 517, in two parts.

This is one of the texts in more than thirty languages that were prepared during the last war to teach our armed forces in the shortest possible time the colloquial forms of the various languages spoken in the regions that they were likely to enter.

While the texts are called "self-teaching," they were produced to be used with a native speaker sitting beside the student whenever possible. Lacking the presence of a native, the student should study with the phonograph records that carry the material of the texts. Even better is to study with both the native and the records.

The material in *Spoken Malay* was actually tried out at Yale with members of the armed forces before it was published. This reviewer during the war saw Professor Dyen with a Malay sitting beside him as he directed the language classes. The Malay was really a "living textbook" that the professor was skillfully using. The records that go with text give the lesson material as the Malays pronounced it.

The text undertakes to catch the daily spoken language with its rapidity, its clippings, and its slurrings. It is the language of sailors, of carpenters, of the city street, of the rubber plantation, etc. It is the language that the dweller among the Malays must in the end learn to understand. The author makes distinctions between the "slow form" and the "rapid form" that languages take, and he presents in the text the "rapid form." Opinion will be divided whether the "rapid form" is the best for early beginners. But at any rate some good results were secured with it at Yale.

The vocabulary is not extensive. It aims to get the student through the ordinary routine of ordinary people in their day's work in Malaya: Greetings, food, clothing, bathing, shoes, telephones, gas stations, etc. If the vocabulary is small, large manipulation is made of it in the drill and practice.

Three styles of Romanization are presented. The phonetic transcription of Professor Dyen, the British Conventional, and the Dutch Conventional. The British and Dutch styles are a necessity for the student who really goes into the language.

The grammar is spread thin, perhaps too thin, through the text, with immediate application to the needs of the lesson. The student could well be helped and certainly not hurt, by more grammar than the text offers.

The reviewer could point out faults in the text, but the author would agree and point out more than the reviewer has discovered. The text was prepared in the midst of war under tremendous pressure of time. If it is republished it will be greatly improved. At the present moment, however, there is no other similar combination of text and records available for the American student. The two hundred hours required for the text and the records will bring some visible results, and a great many more will be gained if the student can find a Malay to sit beside him during the lessons.

WILLIAM E. LOWTHER

Essex, Mass.

World Faith: The Story of the Religions of the United Nations. By Ruth Cranston. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1946. pp. xi, 193.

In the summer of 1946, "as a means to closer unity and better understanding" among religious faiths, Town Hall in New York City conducted a ten weeks' "World Faiths Round Table," where "the basic teachings and ideals of the outstanding World Faiths" were presented and discussed. During the twenty sessions many points of agreement came to light, and with them "Ten Basic Principles, in which all faiths agree, and which might constitute a common World Faith," acceptable to all. Mrs. Ruth Cranston was the leader.

This is one way of dealing with our greatly increased knowledge of the beliefs and practices of non-Christian peoples. Renouncing earlier opinions, it is maintained that the adherents of all religions should accord each other mutual recognition, and seeking for points of agreement should stress these points as a ground for fellowship and cooperation.

Mrs. Cranston lived in the Far East as a girl, has had years of study and personal experience later in China and India, and participated for ten years in the work of international commissions at Geneva. In this book, written in response to many requests, she traverses the field of investigation with which the World Faiths Round Table was concerned. There are sympathetic chapters on Hinduism, Buddhism, the Way of the Chinese Sages, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, followed by a chapter on "One Way for All Mankind: The Religion of the Human Family." The author's aim is to provide a popular and "accurate, but simple description" of these religions, "keyed to the life and spirit of today."

This is not the place to discuss the relation of Christianity to other faiths, or the adequacy of the rule of the Greatest Common Denominator as a panacea for the religious differences of the world. Yet let it be said that a superficial understanding of the situation will not suffice, or a superficial remedy. Confining comment to the chapter on Islam, the attempt to dispel prejudices still prevalent in the West about Muhammad and Islam, and to draw a picture that calls attention to virtues and finer qualities is to the good. Settlement of moot questions in Islamics is not to be expected; however, occasional statements of fact in this chapter are open to question. Rather than to enumerate such statements, the hope may be ex-

pressed that, should the book pass to a second edition, there may be a thorough sifting of details.

JOHN E. MERRILL.

Beacon, N. Y.

Bridge to Islam, A Study of the Religious Forces of Islam and Christianity in the Near East. By E. W. Bethmann. Nashville, Tenn., Southern Publishing Association. pp. 320, with two cover maps.

This is an introductory text book, prepared for the Seventh Day Adventist Churches in America and abroad to introduce them to the great Muslim fields in the Near East and beyond. The author spent twenty years in mission service in the Middle East and was asked to prepare this book.

The bibiliography, although extensive, is not thoroughly representative of the subjects he treats, and in general his outreach is larger than his grasp.

The book naturally divides itself into three parts. The first six chapters deal with Islam, its founder, its message, its fundamentals, and its teachings concerning Jesus Christ.

The second part, pp. 81-237, is geographical, and gives a general survey of the geography of the Near East in its relation to missions, with some account of the work of missionaries in these lands, beginning with Raymund Lull. This is rather sketchy, and does not, for example, give a full account of the work of the Arabian Mission or the Presbyterian Mission in Iran, which could have been based upon better authorities and brought up to date. In Iran we see a Christian Church coming to life and the result of many years of medical and social effort bearing fruitage.

The third part of the book lends its title to the whole. It deals with the bridge and its builders. The bridge consists of those truths which lead us to the heart of Islam, and the builders are the missionaries. This chapter is too brief to handle the subject on which others have written so fully in recent years.

In the bibliography we have a reference to Dr. J. Thayer Addison's great study, but the book itself has not been mastered.

The final chapter is on the Advent message in the Near East, namely the special significance of the teachings of the Seventh Day Adventist school and how early some of their workers penetrated these fields.

One recommends any book that increases interest in the study of Islam and promotes the work of Christian missions. But in this case the special emphasis on the message of this group of disciples is apt to make the book unsuitable for the general reader. One reader of the volume has come to the conclusion that the title of the book is misleading, as it includes too much that cannot be found within the covers of the volume.

S. M. ZWEMER

New York City

CURRENT TOPICS

The American Research Center in Egypt

Announcement is made that early in 1951 the American Research Center will open in Cairo, Egypt. The Center will admit qualified students of American, Egyptian and all other nationalities. As opportunity permits and facilities expand, the Center will interest itself in all periods of the Egyptian past: Prehistoric, Pharaonic, Hellenistic, Roman, Coptic, Islamic; in the past of other areas of the Near and Middle East. It is the belief of the founders that the present cannot be understood without the past, nor the past without direct knowledge of the present.

The new Center will hope to cooperate in this work with other institutions, with those located in the U.S.A., and with the other Schools founded by the Archaeological Institute of America in Athens, Rome, Jerusalem and Baghdad, and with the School for Prehistoric Research, at present operating in North Africa.

Membership in the Center may be granted upon application to persons residing in the United States and to others without geographical or other restriction. Persons interested are invited to correspond with The Secretary, American Research Center in Egypt, Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge 38, Mass.

A Mosque and Islamic Institute in the United States

Our readers will be interested in the following information quoted from an announcement received by the Quarterly:

"A new Mosque and Islamic Institute soon will be erected in Washington, D. C. When completed, it is expected to be one of the most graceful and artistic buildings in the United States.

The thousands of Moslems in this country long have felt a great need for a place of their own in which to worship and study. Surrounded and absorbed by Western culture and its teachings, admirers of this great land which now is their home, they seek also the sheltering simplicity of their own religious center.

Thus it is intended that the new Mosque will become a haven where Moslems, either resident or visiting in the United States, may perform their prayers.

In addition, the new edifice will also constitute a valuable Institute of Islamic Culture. It will provide appropriate facilities which can be enjoyed by all those who, whatever their religion, seek to study famous Islamic teachings, art and culture.

Many collectors of Islamic literature already have signified their intention to contribute hitherto unavailable books to the Library. The Institute itself will publish leaflets and interesting documents dealing with Islamic culture, education and history.

The new Mosque and Islamic Institute will be located in one of the best sections of Washington, D. C., at the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Belmont Road, N.W. It . . . will be erected in pure Arabic architectural style, world famous for its beautiful structure, lines and artistic designs. It is expected to be one of the most notable monuments in Washington, D. C."

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

I. GENERAL

Les Études Historiques en Turquie. R. Mantran. (In *Journal Asiatique,* Paris. 1946-47. pp. 89-111).

An annotated bibliography covering the years 1940 to 1945.

Ibn ad-Daya. Pauline Guirguis. (In *La Revue du Caire,* Caire. April, 1949. pp. 387-403).

An analysis of the "Book of Contemplation" by a tenth century Egyptian.

Literature on the Law of the Middle East. Herbert J. Liebesny. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. October, 1949. pp. 461-469).

An annotated bibliography.

Manuscriptes Arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale. G. Vajda. (In *Revue des Études Islamiques,* Paris. 1949. pp. 89-94).

Tells of minor works by Ibn al 'Arabī and of a fragment of *De Caelo* by Aristotle in Arabic.

Persian Poetry in America. John D. Yohannan. (In the *Iran Review,* New York. November-December, 1949. pp. 41-49).

A study of the literary associations between the two countries from the beginning of our history.

Quelques Poésies Judeo-Arabes du Ms. 411 de la Bibliothèque. Ernest Mainz. (In *Journal Asiatique,* Paris. 1949. pp. 51-83).

Translation, text, grammatical synopses and photos of Arabic poems written in Hebrew.

II. ARABIA

Two Groups of Rock Engravings from the Ḥijāz. Bruce Howe. (In the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Chicago. January, 1950. pp. 8-17).

Description, with photos, of Kufic inscriptions superimposed on animal and human figures.

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

The Fate of Arabdom. Emile Marmorstein. (In *International Affairs,* London. October, 1949. pp. 475-491).

A well-documented article on comparative nationalism.

Islam in an Humanistic Education. G. E. von Grunebaum. (In the *Journal of General Education,* Chicago. October, 1949. pp. 12-31).

A study of Muslim religion, society and civilization.

Post-Mortem on the Arab League. Maurice Moyal. (In *World Affairs,* Los Angeles. April, 1949. pp. 187-195).

A recital of defeats and accomplishments.

The Place of Firdusi in Persian Literature. Saifpour Fatemi. (In the *Iran Review,* New York. November-December, 1949. pp. 28-33).

The *Shahnameh* endures and maintains its great popularity because of its universal appeal and its purity of language.

IV. QUR'ĀN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

Le Droit Terrien sous les Seldjoukides de Turquie. Osman Turan. (In *Revue des Études Islamiques,* Paris. 1948. pp. 25-49).

An article on land tenure.

Origin of Courtly Love and the Problem of Communication. Aziz Ahmad. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. April, 1949. pp. 48-61).

A well-documented account of the Arab invasions of Provence, 720-975.

Retour de la Mecque. (In *L'Afrique et l'Asie,* Paris. 1949, no. 1. pp. 1-2).

Describes a noteworthy resurgence of religious fervor shown in the pilgrimages of 300,000 Muslims to Mecca in 1948.

Le Séparation du Culte Musulman et de l'État en Algérie. Gérard Busson de Janssens. (In *Revue des Études Islamiques,* Paris. 1948. pp. 13-24).

Discusses a situation which offers considerable difficulty to the French.

Spuren Christlicher Glaubenswahrheiten im Koran. P. Joseph Henninger, S.V.D. (In *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Schweiz. Heft 4, 1949. pp. 290-298).

Continues a previous article and deals with heaven and hell.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

Assistance to Arab Refugees. Benjamin Shwadran. (In *Middle East Affairs,* New York. January, 1950. pp. 2-11).

Reviews the work of the Economic Survey Mission.

Economic Review. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington. October, 1949. pp. 455-460).

Includes "Activities of the International Bank in the Middle East" by William Diamond as well as reports on the various countries.

Education in Turkey. T. Verschoyle. (In *International Affairs,* London. January, 1950. pp. 59-70).

Describes types of primary and secondary schools.

Le Problème des Réfugiés et son Incidence sur le Proche-Orient. Louis Massignon. (In *Politique Étrangère,* Paris. June, 1949. pp. 219-232).

The author believes Israel must accept willingly the people who wish to return to their former homes.

Problems of Economic Development in Afghanistan. Peter G. Franck. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington. October, 1949. pp. 421-440).

A second installment which covers finance, agriculture, power and communications, industrial projects, etc.

NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT fuer MISSIONSWISSENSCHAFT
NOUVELLE REVUE de SCIENCE MISSIONNAIRE

Editors: Prof. J. Beckmann SMB *(Schöneck NW)*—P. Dr. L. Kilger OSB *(Uznach)*—Prof. Dr. P. de Menasce OP *(Paris)*—P. Dr. Franz Solan Schaeppi OMCap *(Solothurn)*.

Since its first appearance in 1945 this Missiological Quarterly has become a truly international publication and has now spread all over the world. An international staff of outstanding scholars guarantees its high standing. In each issue it provides information on Missionary Theology, History of Missions, present-day conditions and problems, review of latest periodicals and books, etc.

Subscriptions: Switzerland 10.40 sfr. Abroad: $4.00.

Some articles in recent issues: Beaupin: L'organisation internationale du Travail.—Beckman SMB: Die Pflege der kath. Missionswissenschaft in den einzelnen Ländern.—Henninger SVD: Spuren christlicher Glaubenswahrheiten im Koran.—Laufer MSC: Die Stellung der Mission zum Geheimbundwesen auf Neu-Britannien.—Laures: Das japanische Kaiserhaus und die alte kath. Mission. —Schilling OFM: Gründung der Hospitäler der Franziskaner in Miyako (1594/95).—Sy ME: Précurseurs de l'Oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi.

Communications should be addressed to the

SEMINARY SCHOENECK-BECKENRIED (Switzerland)